

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Job 30: 5: *Behold, God is mighty; He is mighty in strength and wisdom.*

Almighty God, at this noon hour, our hearts are turning unto Thee in the ancient and sacred attitude and prayer habit of our human race.

May our vision of Thy greatness and goodness, Thy righteousness and justice, Thy love and mercy, be so real and compelling that we shall surrender ourselves wholeheartedly to Thy will and obey it gladly and gratefully.

We earnestly beseech Thee to endow our President, our Speaker, and our chosen Representatives with insight to see and read clearly Thy mind and wisdom in all the events and experiences of this new day.

Grant that we may have patience and perseverance, when we are beset by problems that seem to become more difficult to solve the longer we ponder and discuss them.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 178. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, to the bill (H.R. 5945) entitled, "An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1057) entitled, "An act to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KEATING to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and

Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64-10.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY KALICH, TALLY CLERK

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that our tally clerk, Harry W. Kalich, is planning to retire on March 1. Harry Kalich has been here in the House of Representatives in that capacity for approximately 18 years, and during that time has made himself an invaluable employee and an almost indispensable man.

Harry comes from my own congressional district in the county of Queens in New York, and has been active in civics and politics in that area for 39 years. He began his climb up the political ladder in the sheriff's office in Queens County, where he served as a deputy sheriff and entry clerk. He was then appointed to the position of deputy tax appraiser for the State of New York, covering a large area and working out of the Brooklyn division. He was subsequently elevated to the position of commissioner of motor vehicles for Queens County, and maintained an active interest in politics during all those years. He was a Democratic leader in his area in Queens for many years, and in addition served as a Democratic State committeeman in the second assembly district in that county for 8 years. His ability and dedication to both Government and politics were recognized and

in 1944 he was selected for the post of tally clerk, and has served us all—on both sides of the aisle—faithfully and well for almost 18 years.

His health has not been all it should be during the last several years, but this has not affected in any way the cooperation and consideration he has shown each and every Member of this House. Now that he must retire, on orders from his physician, we shall all miss him and the many courtesies he has performed in so many ways. His long career as a public servant, on the local, State, and National level is now coming to an end, and he will be sorely missed.

I sincerely hope he and his wife will have many years of relaxation and happiness ahead of them in the years to come. I am sure that Harry, in particular, will look with fond memories on his long association with the many Members of the House of Representatives, who have held him in such high esteem, and who, in turn, have earned his friendship and respect.

I know all my colleagues join me in wishing him the best of everything for the future.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in the tributes to Harry W. Kalich, a personal friend, a fellow citizen from Queens County, N.Y., and a great public servant.

Mr. Kalich has given 18 years of meritorious service here in the House of Representatives and were this all he would have earned the accolades of us all. However, Harry's service to his community, State, and Nation started long before he arrived on the Washington scene. He has given 39 years of loyal dedicated service.

When I arrived in Washington as a freshman Member of this body, it was a source of satisfaction to me to have this friendly face from home here to greet me. He was always available for counsel and advice on the legislative procedures which were so new to me at the time. I was and am proud of the fact that we both hail from the great Borough of Queens in the city of New York.

Our friend will be greatly missed by this body, but I know that we all know he has earned his retirement and we wish for him and his lovely wife many long years of happiness and good health in the leisure now before them.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my dear friend, Mr. Harry W. Kalich, our tally clerk.

He has rendered faithful and invaluable service in the House of Representatives for 18 years. Harry is a perfect gentleman in the truest sense of the

word. His unfailing courtesy, friendliness, and cheerful service to the Members of this House have endeared him to all of us.

Harry Kalich has had an illustrious career in political life for the past 39 years. He has served in many important offices, among them, as sheriff of Queens County, deputy tax appraiser of the State of New York, commissioner of motor vehicles of Queens; he also was secretary of former Congressman Roe.

Now Harry Kalich has announced that he will retire at the end of this month. My sincere wish for him is that he will enjoy many years of leisure and all the good things that leisure can bring. He is most deserving of all the happiness that life can hold. We shall miss him very much; he will not be forgotten. He leaves us knowing he has our affection and gratitude for all his efforts in our behalf.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it was in 1936 that I was first privileged to run for the office that I now hold. The then Ninth District of New York encompassed part of Queens County. I was therefore privileged during that year, and ever since, to consider Harry Kalich one of my fine friends.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Kalich has served his county, his party, and his country with credit and with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I join with his many friends today in wishing for him many, many years of health and happiness. We shall miss him, but we shall not forget him.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I too join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend, Harry Kalich, our tally clerk, who has announced his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I have not known any man in my 20 years of service as a member of a legislative body who has been more kind and more diligent in his duties than Harry Kalich.

Mr. Speaker, I have not only been associated with him here in the House of Representatives, but also as a friend and a resident of a neighboring county of mine on Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss Harry Kalich. I join with my colleagues in saying that I trust he will enjoy a long life and many years of happiness in the future.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for paying tribute to an outstanding employee of this House. It is good to do this. It is good that we recognize there are a great many employees of the House who do a faithful and conscientious job.

We will all miss Harry Kalich, we will miss his friendship, we will miss his explosive fashions.

New York can take credit for bringing to this House a very wonderful, a very fine fellow, but we should recognize also his perspicacity. He married a lady from Massachusetts. So we compliment him for that, too.

I join with the New York delegation and all of the Members of this House in wishing him well in the future. His health has not been too good. I remember only last year when he underwent a very serious operation.

We will miss his cheerfulness, we will miss his personality.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was somewhat with a feeling of sadness that I first learned of the impending retirement of my longtime friend, Harry Kalich. I have been privileged to know Harry for approximately 30 years. He has ever been a fine friend, and I have greatly appreciated this friendship over the many years.

Harry Kalich has been an outstanding official of this House for many years and has made many friends on both sides of the aisle. I shall always be grateful to him for his many courtesies, and I should like to join my colleagues in this body in saying to Harry and to his lovely wife we wish them both good health and happiness in their well-earned retirement, and hope that the retirement period will be for many, many years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman has taken this time to pay tribute to a worthy employee of the House of Representatives. Upon his retirement we shall miss one of the most devoted servants of the House, and one of the very fine gentlemen of this country.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate all of the fine things that have been said about Harry Kalich. He has served all of us well and faithfully for many years. Along with my colleagues, I shall miss him greatly, and I do wish for him the happiest retirement a man can have.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want this high tribute to be an all-American tribute. I want our very dear friend to know that we in Florida love him too.

I join with my colleagues in thanking him for the excellent service he has rendered, and I wish for him many, many happy years in his retirement.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Kalich, who is 75 years old though he does not look it. We will all be very sorry to see him go. He has been of great assistance to all Members, and I wish him and Mrs. Kalich great comfort and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to join my colleagues in paying a well deserved tribute to Harry Kalich for his many years of devoted and conscientious public service. We all regret his retiring from the splendid service he has rendered in this Chamber.

I think my feelings may be somewhat different from the others because I have an idea I will be able to see Mr. and Mrs. Kalich many times down my way. We will look forward to their visits to Florida, and hope they will be quite often.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in praise of Harry Kalich, a distinguished public servant who, I am honored and pleased to say, spent many pleasant years in my hometown on Long Island, during which time he not only made many friends but contributed much to our community life.

The Congress loss is his family's gain, and I wish Harry Kalich many happy years in retirement.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing regret at the retirement of Harry Kalich and wish him and his wife much happiness in the future. We owe him thanks for the wonderful job he has done. I hope we can even convert him into a Floridian and get to see him in Florida many times.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in this tribute to Harry Kalich and wish him well. But let me remind him that, while he may visit Florida many times, his home is in New York. Harry Kalich has been a devoted and dedicated public servant whose engaging personality will be greatly missed by all of us in this body. As he leaves us after so many years of public service, I know we all wish Mrs. Kalich and him many years of future happiness.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I should like to join my colleagues in this tribute to Harry Kalich. I wish him the very best in a long and pleasant retirement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I join my colleagues in their statements about Harry Kalich, and wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our genial friend, Harry W. Kalich, the efficient tally clerk of the House of Representatives.

We are all sorry to learn that he is retiring but can understand his reasons and desire for seeking retirement and some years of rest. He is one of the most courtly and most courteous officials of the House and is always most helpful. We shall all miss him—we shall miss his warm personality.

Until our friends had indicated that Harry was a native of New York, I had always referred to him as "Colonel" Kalich—a son of Tennessee. I consider him as an adopted Tennessean. He is indeed an all-American.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the first persons I met in the Capitol when I arrived as a freshman Congressman over 5 years ago was Harry Kalich, our very distinguished tally clerk. Harry Kalich is the kind of fellow that has in a very quiet way accomplished his work without fanfare and with great dignity. I can say that my high regard for him has grown steadily over this 5-year period and my friendship and feeling for him has steadily increased. On many occasions he made me aware of the many procedures in the House and he has been of great assistance to me in countless other areas.

Harry Kalich has served as tally clerk for 18 years. He came to Washington with a solid background in public office. He has held many positions of public trust over the years having served as deputy sheriff of Queens County, N.Y. for 3½ years, as secretary of former Congressman James A. Rowe of New York, deputy tax appraiser for the State of New York and also as Commissioner of Motor Vehicles of Queens County, N.Y. He has been a loyal, devoted, and dedicated public servant in every position of public trust he has held.

As tally clerk in this House he has given unstintingly of his time and we have been very fortunate to have a man of such fine qualities serving in this most important position.

It is a great privilege to know Harry Kalich. He has always been courteous and helpful to all the Members of Congress and their staffs.

His exceptional qualities of dignity, courtesy, and personality reflect what a wonderful person that he is. Harry Kalich never portrayed any other picture than one of a man who was content in his job and anxious to be helpful to all.

Of course in mentioning these few and inadequate words of praise for Harry Kalich I could not let the opportunity to pass without comment on his neatness of person. Harry Kalich always dressed with an excellent selection of clothing. His neckties, his vests, his very personal appearance reflected the habits of a person who was meticulous in his selection

of garments. His neatness in clothing was also indicative of his neatness in his personal affairs. Yes, Harry Kalich had a certain perfection about him that prompted everyone who met him to admire his way of life.

Many times during the past 5 years I have enjoyed the company of Harry Kalich and his beautiful and lovely wife Ann May who of course came from Massachusetts. So you see Harry always used good judgment even in the selection of a bride. They are a wonderful couple and it is my fervent hope and prayer that they will enjoy each others company for many years to come.

I do not know what Harry's plans are for the future. I do know that if he and Mrs. Kalich decide to spend his retirement in Framingham, Mass., the former residence of Mrs. Kalich, the people of that area will welcome back Mrs. Kalich and will roll out the red carpet for Harry and receive him with open hearts. God bless him.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is always painful and distressing to have to say—goodbye, good luck—to anyone with whom we have been closely associated. When the occasion involves a long and dear friend it becomes a parting of immeasurable sadness and regret.

The most distinguished and efficient tally clerk of this House, Harry W. Kalich, was among the very first friends I made after entering the House. The courteous assistance and guidance Harry gave me, and so many other Members of the House through these passing years, about procedures in the Chamber here were of immense value and saved the expenditure of a great deal of unnecessary time and energy.

However, I believe that Harry has more truly endeared himself to all of us by the forceful impact of his sterling character and striking personality. Throughout the years he has been associated with us here he has well earned his acknowledged reputation for conducting and directing a most efficient and cooperative office. He has never failed to hold out a helping hand, not only to the Members of this House, but to all members of their staffs and House employees. Many are the Members here who have been prevented from making a procedural misstep through Harry's alert, thoughtful, and knowledgeable guidance. All of these vitally important gestures he has made without ever any pretense or overbearance, but with the utmost dignity and decorum. But beyond this, Harry Kalich has, I think, provided for all of us a model and example of the manner in which a man should project himself in daily life in this challenging world. In all the years I have known Harry neither I nor anyone of you have ever seen him when he was not pleasant, when he was not courteous, when he was not ready with his warm and encouraging smile, when his head was not confidently uplifted, when he was not ready to engage in gay repartee. As I am well aware, Harry has the cares and the concerns and the burdens of each of us and more of them than most of us. Nevertheless, his irrepressible good nature and his effervescent per-

sonality, impeccably attired, has shone forth upon us and brightened this Chamber's atmosphere each day that we have been assembled. It is not in this man to groan, or grump, or growl because I think he has truly found the secret of successful living. I think the secret may be contained in these few lines I believe reveal his philosophy of life:

There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
No one walks this way alone.
All that we put into the lives of others
Comes back into our own.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed highly honored and very proud to call Harry W. Kalich my dear, personal friend and consider his friendship to have been one of the real blessings of my own life. If he gets back even the smallest portion of what he has given to others, in the days ahead, his philosophy will have been justified, and I think such will occur.

Since he has determined to leave, and none of us have been able to make him change his mind, we must attempt to resign ourselves to his leaving.

Mr. Speaker, as Harry W. Kalich, tally clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, prepares to leave his post we join together in wishing for him, and his gracious charming wife, Ann—who incidentally is from my congressional district—continuing good health and good fortune through many more fruitful years. Harry, you will forever remain in our grateful hearts and you will be frequently in our remembering prayers. May God bless and keep and direct you and yours into a new and rewarding future.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it can well be said that every Member and associate of this House is understandably deeply regretful to see our truly beloved friend and valued helpmate, Mr. Harry W. Kalich, leave us and thus terminate his more than 18 years of outstanding, highly meritorious service to this great body.

We had hoped that Harry would remain with us and with the House for years to come. After all, his name is synonymous with the House and he seems indeed like some veritably immovable fixture in the heart of this great deliberative body, serving as an integral functioning part and as one of the real guiding, motivating spirits of one of our most important operational activities.

In that sense, certainly this Chamber will never be the same without him, and this would be true not only because we will sorely miss his tremendously valuable services to our membership, but because we will also greatly miss his incredibly lovable, generous, and inspiring personality.

Harry Kalich is one of the very rare individuals whose fine qualities are so numerous that they are extremely difficult to define or describe. It is almost impossible to articulate or adequately enumerate all the wonderful qualities that make Harry Kalich stand out so vividly in our minds and in our hearts as a man that everyone loves and respects.

The duties of tally clerk in the House of Representatives are of highest importance to the efficient functioning of the House itself. This high calling is indeed a most difficult and challenging task. It requires a wide spectrum of special qualifications that are as much innate as they are acquired.

The tally clerk must be exceptionally well equipped. Ordinarily, he must be possessed of highest character, sound education, training and experience, exceptionally specialized ability and a fast-moving agile mind. He must be capable of speedy observations and prompt decisions. He must possess a thorough knowledge of our membership and a capacity for working with other officials of the House.

More than that, he must be mentally alert, highly experienced in his calling and he must constantly demonstrate the meticulous grasp of the mass of detail demanded by the imperative need of efficient performance of his duties.

In addition, he must exemplify a genuine enthusiasm for his work, as well as those physical and mental endowments always required by extended periods of careful concentration, strictest accountability and persistent, painstaking attention to oftentimes incessant routines occasioned by the rules of the House.

He must have an unusual flair for accuracy and correctness and unflagging diligence.

Without men of such high qualifications handling the affairs of these particular activities of the House, required of our tally clerks, our business could well be stagnated and delayed, and our efficiency seriously impaired.

But Harry Kalich has admirably met all these exacting requirements of our rules. He has met them in superabundant measure. He has excelled even our highest standards. He has made here, during his tenure, a brilliant record of devoted, efficient, faithful service to this House that could never possibly be excelled. It will long stand among us, and in this body, as the highest inspiration and example for ourselves and, all those who serve us in this great legislative forum.

That Harry Kalich should have measured up as magnificently as he has, occasions no surprise for those of us who know his background and who have had the privilege and pleasure of his friendship.

Before he came here 18 years ago, this distinguished public servant had already carved a proud niche for himself in serving his fellow man. In every field in which he served he brought to bear the splendid qualifications and spirit of dedication which we have seen him display in this body.

Thus, the rich experience that he gained in other positions of trust and high responsibility, not only stood him in good stead in the House, but enabled him to serve us with a distinction born of keen awareness of his tasks, and rare understanding of how to discharge them with exceptional efficiency and ever-present dependability.

But Harry Kalich brought a great deal more to his duties than a zeal for perfectionism. In performing his work and in everything he undertook, to be sure, perfectionism was one of the most conspicuous traits of his many-sided personality. It was rooted in his very philosophy of life—a philosophy that always put first things first. It was soundly grounded in fundamental concepts that were inseparably associated with his entire being.

He came from a school that believed in the tenets of our American Government, our way of life, our culture, our basic ideals, and our resolve to preserve them at all costs. His zeal for sartorial perfection was but one side, yet for him an important side of the beliefs and practices which were followed so religiously by this buoyant, amiable spirit in our midst, and which placed upon him an inescapable impression of the man who does things thoroughly and well.

He was a man of deep loyalties and profound sympathies, instinctively desiring to give of himself with unselfishness and wholeheartedness to help and advance every good cause that he embraced and to make his life complete in the realm of service, tireless, effective work and immeasurable contributions to the House, his country, and his friends.

"Some men are born great, some men achieve greatness, while others have greatness thrust upon them." Harry Kalich fell into the first category. He was born into a family of rugged, devoted, patriotic people, and he grew up in an atmosphere where faith in his Maker and devotion to his country were expected of everyone. He was a born leader among men and throughout his life, as well as in this body, he exemplified this quality in innumerable ways.

He generously assisted the Members and his coworkers. He was ready with his counsel, willing with his assistance, devoted and loyal, in the best sense of these words, in fulfilling every measure or mission dictated by the canons of honor, honesty, and dedicated service and friendship that he learned in his family circle and which have always guided his actions.

One of our greatest poets quoted the meaning of friendship in inspiring words when he said: "When thou hast a friend and his adoption tried, grapple him to thy soul with hoops of steel."

This could well be said of Harry Kalich because he not only fully grasped the meaning of these words, but he lived them throughout his life, and one of the most inspiring, satisfying, and pleasurable experiences of my life has been to know Harry Kalich.

The House has been fortunate and we, who serve here, have been fortunate and blessed beyond measure, to have a man like Harry working with us. We are all the better for having known and worked with him, and those of us who were lucky enough to know and to enjoy his close friendship can appreciate best the scope of his devotion to the House and the charming, lovable qualities that so endeared him to us.

To be sure, it is very difficult to praise with any sense of accuracy the

virtues and contributions of this man. They are somehow not quite measurable. For the most part, these qualities are to be felt, rather than to be defined, but they leave a deep, everlasting impression of virtue, steadfastness, loyalty, courage, and amiability that can never be forgotten.

In recent years, Harry Kalich has not enjoyed particularly good health, and that is probably one of the reasons for his retirement at this time. He was never heard to complain about his indisposition. He accepted it as he accepted everything else in his lifetime with a supreme faith, with a sense of submission to the Divine Master and firm confidence in the future.

I am very proud to have known Harry Kalich. I am very thankful to him for his superlative contributions to this House and to our country. I heartily congratulate him upon his outstanding magnificent service, which we will long remember here.

Harry Kalich will always have a very warm place in our hearts and in our sentiments of deep appreciation. I especially cherish the valued friendship that I have enjoyed with him and with his beautiful, gracious, charming wife, a native of my own great State of Massachusetts, who has been such a tower of strength and assistance to him throughout the years.

Harry may be leaving the House, but he will always be with us in our thoughts, in our appreciation, in our hearts, in our gratitude, and in our affections.

Whenever I think of Harry, I think of the great poet, Goethe, who in his day wrote much of human virtue, loyalty, courage, and the sublime qualities that touch the human heart, and spark human achievement.

"Courage," said Goethe, "is the greatest quality of the human heart. Without it, thou wert better never born."

Courage is the badge of Harry Kalich.

May the good Lord for many years to come bring to him, his beloved wife, and all his dear ones, choicest blessings of good health, success, happiness, and peace.

May every joy and good fortune attend them always.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of Harry Kalich's retirement as tally clerk of this House is felt, I am sure, by all the Members with mixed feelings. It is with regret that we will feel his absence from the front desk where his handsome, solid countenance seemed to be an expected part of the House of Representatives. And, it is with joyous heart that we know Harry will soon be relaxing and spending the many years ahead with his beloved Anne in total enjoyment of comfort, happiness, and good health.

I will truly miss seeing Harry in these environs. But, I am going to welcome him back to his beloved Queens where we have enjoyed being neighbors for so many years. As a matter of fact, while I was cutting my political teeth, Harry was one of the stalwart community and political personalities of our borough. We are of different political faiths, Mr. Speaker, but we are dear friends and

have always respected each other's opinions and the sincerity of our convictions.

Harry's entire life has been dedicated to politics and to public service. And he has been a credit to both. Harry has always adhered to the philosophy that good politics is good government and he has personally exemplified this philosophy.

In this House I am certain every Member admires him for his faithful, capable, and sensitive work in recording the votes of hundreds of Members, day after day, year after year, for 18 devoted years. And the greatest tribute to the man—and I have known him for 35 years—is that I have never heard anyone say anything but nice things about him. What greater accomplishment can one gain in life?

Mr. Speaker, if ever a man has earned happy retirement years, it is Harry Kalich. After these many years of service to his city, State, and Nation, Harry can now reflect with pride on a life well spent. And all of us who know him can feel enriched in having his friendship.

Although Harry will not be here to answer the roll after February 29, we know that he is recorded in our hearts as being present, always.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Harry W. Kalich, chief tally clerk of the House, is retiring at the end of February after almost 18 years of service with us. After an earlier career in government in New York he first came to Washington to serve as secretary to Congressman James A. Roe and subsequently assumed the duties in the House of Representatives which he has performed so ably.

Harry Kalich has been a devoted public servant, performing an essential function which requires accurate, careful, and meticulous work. Now, on the basis of doctor's orders, he is compelled to accept much-deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, in view of his fine service to you and to Members as a whole, I believe it altogether fitting that coupled with our expressions of regret at his retirement, we wish him every success, happiness, and a return to good health. We are extremely grateful to him for his devoted and distinguished service over these many years.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Harry Kalich is a wonderful friend to all of us. I shall cherish his friendship as long as I live. He is a devoted public servant; an ideal public servant, and I would like to join all my colleagues in saying to Harry and his family we wish for them the best that life affords and may he enjoy his well-earned retirement for many, many years.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a real pleasure for me to join in tribute to Harry Kalich. Not only has he been a very good friend for these many years, but he has been an invaluable and dedicated public servant, and a genuine asset to this House and to the country.

Harry's life has been one of service, and his personal qualities and professional competence have earned him the sincere admiration and affection of all of us who have known and worked with him. I am sure that he must feel a deep

sense of gratitude knowing that he leaves us with a job well done, and I wish him and his charming wife all the happy years ahead that they so richly deserve.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Kalich, a neighbor of mine in Queens County, N.Y.

We in the community recognize him as an outstanding leader in all fields beneficial to the community in which he resides, and we wholeheartedly approve his unselfish efforts as a leader and moving spirit in these activities.

Prior to coming to Washington, Harry served with distinction in the office of the Sheriff of Queens County, as deputy tax appraiser in the State tax department, and as commissioner of motor vehicles for Queens County.

Harry came to Washington in 1945 and took over the job as tally clerk of the House of Representatives, where he has earned the respect of all Members. During this time we have found him able, courteous, most cooperative, and friendly, and we appreciate the dignified manner in which he conducted the office of tally clerk.

Certainly, he has earned his retirement, and my hope is that he and Mrs. Kalich will enjoy many years of leisure and happiness.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending best wishes to Harry W. Kalich who will retire from his duties as tally clerk at the end of the month.

The accolades which have thus far been showered on him are richly deserved. For Harry has served the House of Representatives long and well in a position of recognized responsibility.

For myself, I miss him. Our association through the years has been a most pleasant one; and, for me, his announced retirement came as a surprise. Harry's youthful appearance would make it seem that such an event would be years in the future.

But, nonetheless, this retirement is well deserved. Harry can, indeed, look back on years of accomplishment and good deeds.

My wife and I join in wishing Harry and his wife all the best things in the golden years to come. May God's choicest blessings come to you and yours.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD regarding Harry Kalich.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CASTRO IS A PASSENGER IN EVERY TRIUMPH CAR

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, everyone is aware of the fact that a British company, Leyland Motors, is engaged in an \$11 million contract to provide 400 buses for Communist Cuba. I feel, however, that there are other facts concerning Leyland Motors of which every American should be aware.

Leyland Motors has a subsidiary company, Standard Triumph, which is engaged in the manufacture of sports cars, commonly known as Triumphs. Great numbers of these automobiles are shipped and sold within the United States. In the last 4 years, Standard Triumph, according to the Department of Commerce, has sold over 63,000 autos in the United States. The last complete full year figures are from 1962 and they reveal some 15,781 cars were sold, which at \$2,500 per car, would amount to over \$39 million in total sales.

Great Britain and other "allies" of this country see fit to carry on trade with Cuba. Yesterday the State Department announced that it was cutting off aid to those countries. However, we can do more. Keeping in line with a policy suggested by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, American consumers can boycott those goods manufactured by companies shipping to Cuba which are sold here in the United States.

A perfect example of this is Standard Triumph. While Leyland Motors sees fit to trade in complete disregard of American policy, it nevertheless keeps its hand in the pocket of the American economy. American consumers, by refraining from purchasing Triumph automobiles, can help bring that hand out empty. Castro is truly a passenger in every Triumph car.

HALTING TRADE WITH COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the threat which Communist Cuba poses to this hemisphere and to the free world cannot be minimized. As has been pointed out countless times in this Chamber, from this base communism is being exported into every nook and cranny of South and Central America. It is no idle threat and must be met with bold action.

I commend the action of the President with the announcement that foreign aid is being cut off to several of those nations that are continuing to trade with Communist Cuba.

Trade with Communist Cuba by buying their products and selling to them, can only strengthen the hand of Castro and is a shortsighted policy on the part of our allies. They have deluded themselves into believing that communism can be lived with—while at the same time this insidious doctrine and its perpetrators seek violent overthrow of each of the democratic governments of the world.

I believe the action of the President to be a bold one and in line with the expressed will of the Congress. Aid to several other nations is being studied and I trust that bold action will be taken with regard to them.

To continue to subsidize nations that trade with Communist Cuba is to be a part in financing the continued existence of Dictator Castro over the enslaved people of Cuba, and what is more horrible and terrifying, to allow these Communist masters to continue to train and send out agents whose sole purpose is to plot the violent overthrow of every government now not under the heels of the Communist menace.

I commend President Johnson for his action. I urge that all aid to nations trading with Communist Cuba be halted immediately. We cannot afford to do less.

This Nation cannot afford to both subsidize trade with Cuba and at the same time decry such trading. It would make a farce out of our foreign policy.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND COMMERCE OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Finance and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's decision in the congressional apportionment case last Monday sows further seeds of mischief in our Federal system. The majority of the Court now abrogates to the judicial branch the power to determine how a coordinate branch of government—the Congress—shall be composed.

Mr. Speaker, the Court has departed from its constitutional role as arbiter of legal rights and has involved itself in political questions.

The Members of Congress and of each State legislature are sworn to uphold the

Constitution too, and the organization of government is a legislative, not a judicial function. We face the task, Mr. Speaker, of somehow redefining the judicial power of the United States, and we should be about it, if the other coordinate branches of government are not to be swallowed up and made subservient to an all-powerful judiciary.

REDUCING INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight, Monday, February 24, to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 8363.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to advise the Members of the House that H.R. 9022, a bill to amend the International Development Association Act, will not come up this afternoon as previously announced but will be programed for next week.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 623 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Adair	Dowdy	Miller, Calif.
Ashley	Dulski	Miller, N.Y.
Ashmore	Edmondson	Montoya
Avery	Elliott	O'Brien, Ill.
Bass	Finnegan	O'Konski
Battin	Flynt	Powell
Berry	Forrester	Price
Bolton	Goodell	Rains
Frances P. Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Oliver P. Broomfield	Gubser	Riehlman
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Roberts, Ala.
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Ind.	Roberts, Tex.
Bruce	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Burkhalter	Kee	Roybal
Burleson	Kelly	St. Onge
Casey	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Cederberg	Kornegay	Short
Celler	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
Cohelan	Lesinski	Tupper
Collier	Lindsay	Udall
Colmer	Lloyd	Weaver
Corman	McDowell	Westland
Cramer	McLoskey	Williams
Davis, Tenn.	Macdonald	Willis
Diggs	Mailliard	Younger
	Martin, Mass.	
	Meador	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE COAST GUARD

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution, House Resolution 623, provides for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9640, which authorizes appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard vital mission facilities have become generally inadequate. There is no branch of the services of the United States that has contributed more to the security of this country in war and in peace than the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard in recent years has had an inordinate number of additional responsibilities and duties placed upon it. In connection with these responsibilities and duties, of course, it has taken unto itself many additional activities. Some of these have been the recent expansion of its work to cover the Federal Boating Act of 1958, the growth of the Russian fishing fleet in Atlantic waters, the incursion of the Japanese fishing fleet in Alaskan waters, the Cuban crisis and the constant patrol in southern Florida waters caused thereby.

In addition to these matters is the practice of Russian fishing trawlers in their passage from Cuba to North Atlantic waters of trespassing in the territorial waters of the United States.

The Coast Guard equipment has been in constant usage and, as a result of this constant usage, the Coast Guard has become handicapped and imperiled by inadequate, obsolete, and worn-out equipment. This authorization bill is but a bare minimum, Mr. Speaker, but it is a start toward the extensive and necessary replacement of outmoded, antiquated equipment and facilities. This bill authorizes expenditures of \$93,299,000. The bill makes no change in existing law.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 623.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 9640, with 2 hours of general debate. The purpose of the bill is to provide authorization for the procurement of vessels, aircraft, and the construction of shore and offshore establishments for the U.S. Coast Guard for the fiscal year 1965. The bill as approved by the committee authorizes a total of \$93,299,000. It has been noted by the committee, and they so state in their report, that in general the committee is concerned with the generally inadequate facilities, both ashore and afloat, with which the Coast Guard must perform its vital missions.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a generally conceded fact. It has often seemed to me that the Coast Guard was the stepchild among the services. I know for a fact that the installations at New London certainly need a great deal of attention at this time, notably the fieldhouse, which has also been considered in this legislation and has been approved.

I think it can be well said that the Coast Guard has always given a dollar's worth for every dollar that has ever been spent on it. For this reason there is no objection to the rule, and I trust that the bill will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9640) with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft, and the construction of shore and offshore establishments for the U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal year 1965.

On page 2 of the committee report the estimated cost of the various items in the bill are tabulated under the three major headings of the capital items involved: vessels, aircraft, and construction. They are all essential items which collectively represent but a small first step in a long-range program to rehabilitate and modernize the equipment and facilities of this vital agency.

General enabling authority under existing law will continue to cover such matters as repair of existing equipment and facilities, personnel, and the other usual housekeeping and maintenance items of a Federal agency.

This is the first annual authorization bill of its kind for the Coast Guard.

Prior to World War II, when the Coast Guard was considerably smaller and its responsibilities were far less than at present, the general procedure was to request, from time to time, authorization from the cognizant legislative committee for the procurement of individual capital units. This procedure continued up until 1949 when title 14 of the United States Code, relating to the Coast Guard, was codified. The codification granted blanket enabling authority to the Secretary of the Treasury, thus obviating the necessity for specific authorization requests to be considered by the legislative committee prior to appropriation action.

In recent years the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has become greatly concerned over the woeful and deteriorating condition of the Coast Guard's equipment and facilities. We found, moreover, that we were losing touch with important needs and developments of the agency due to our lack of continuing authorization responsibility. Thus it was that last year this lack was remedied by the enactment of legislation—Public Law 88-45—which provided:

That after fiscal year 1964, funds may not be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the construction of shore or offshore establishments, or for the procurement of vessels or aircraft, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after December 31, 1963.

That act, modeled after the authorization procedure for comparable procurement and construction for the Department of Defense, was reported only after thorough hearings as to needs and with the full cooperation of high-level Treasury and Coast Guard officials.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Over the years, the responsibility of the Coast Guard has increased to a large extent, either because of the delegation of new functions through legislation or the expansion of activities. In the category of new responsibilities is

the Federal Boating Act of 1958, which placed upon the Coast Guard new powers and responsibilities with reference to recreational boating and greatly extended its geographical range, through virtually every State in the United States.

At the same time, its activities in the field of existing responsibilities has increased through the vast multiplication of navigational aids and developments in electronics.

At present, the Coast Guard is active in 49 of the 50 States of the United States, Wyoming being the sole exception. Its stations range almost literally over the entire world.

Its combination of functions is unique among the nations of the world, and I feel that we can view its accomplishments with justified pride. Unfortunately, however, over the years we have tended to take too much for granted and have failed to furnish it with the necessary modern tools to perform its many functions. Thus, for example, its fleet of 36 high-endurance cutters, which are vital for iceberg patrol, weather ship and long-range rescue activities, is obsolete.

Mr. Chairman, but for the splendid and great interest of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Coast Guard, this Service would be in a more deplorable situation.

The newest vessels in the group of the important high-endurance cutters are war-built converted Navy seaplane tenders which were never designed to sustain the constant buffeting of North Atlantic and subarctic storms.

Its fleet of medium-endurance cutters, which constitute the backbone of law enforcement and medium-range patrol activities, consists of a hybrid group of vessels which demand constant excessive maintenance.

The dedicated officers and men of the service not only are operating with inadequate tools, but are compelled to live under conditions that are substandard by any reasonable test. Thus, for example, on Annette Island in Alaska, men and their families are living in war-built quonset huts.

The Coast Guard helicopters, which are performing an increasingly important function in search and rescue duties, are outmoded, and where the Navy places the life of a helicopter at 8 years, the Coast Guard is still operating some that are 12 years old.

The present bill represents a considerable increase in the amount sought by the Coast Guard for capital items and it is my view, and that of the Merchant Marine Committee, that it errs on the side of inadequacy. The amount sought by the Treasury for capital items was \$71,800,000, the items of which are shown in the committee report on the bill.

In the course of its consideration of the bill, the committee came to the conclusion that it was imperative to replace not one, but two, of the high-endurance cutters, and to procure not six, but eight of the medium-endurance, a total increase in the requested authorization of \$21,500,000.

This represents an increase in the authorization as submitted by the Treasury from \$71,800,000 to \$93,500,000.

The committee is convinced of the need for all items covered by this bill as it is reported to the House with amendments.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time it has been brought home to me that some Members of this House do not know of the scope of the Coast Guard's activities which provide valuable services to the life of this country in almost every State. The public at large does not appreciate the many varied and important functions of this agency in its peacetime roles and missions as a part of the Treasury Department, though its record as a military service with the Navy during World II has received much more public attention.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to some of the services that the Coast Guard renders. I point out one of the worst flood disasters that occurred in 1959 when after 3 days of torrential rains the Naugatuck and Housatonic Rivers in Connecticut spilled over five State areas, bringing havoc in its wake. Most seriously damaged by the disaster was Connecticut, including Stamford and other towns. Other States affected were New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

For days a large contingent of Coast Guard personnel worked tirelessly to save the sick, to serve the old, and the women and children, anyone in need of help. Without a doubt they saved many lives.

One might reflect on the floods in the Mississippi Valley where the Coast Guard has had to take its equipment and personnel from the Atlantic Coast, away from the required services that were needed in the coastal and other areas of their regular assignment, to go into the interior of the Mississippi Valley and render life-saving services and other necessary functions that they are required to do throughout the country. Their missions are voluminous.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a memorandum touching upon a few additional examples of the beneficial work of the Coast Guard in recent years:

EXAMPLES OF COAST GUARD ACTIVITIES

Last week the Nation's newspapers headlined the dramatic rescue by a Coast Guard patrol boat of 11 passengers from the Yacht *Hattie D*, sinking rapidly off Cape Mendocino, Calif. Working against time, the Coast Guard managed to get the passengers off just before the yacht went under. Later, a Coast Guard helicopter brought the passengers to shore.

Several months earlier, in the fall of 1963, the world was electrified by the Coast Guard's almost miraculous rescue of a German seaman who had fallen overboard in the middle of the Atlantic. The Coast Guard cutter *Absecon* was alerted and it sped to the rescue. Through the application of time-tested search techniques and good judgment, the *Absecon* saved the German sailor against odds of a billion to one.

This is the Coast Guard at work in search and rescue on and over the high seas, an area in which it has won worldwide acclaim. In the past year, the Coast Guard saved 1,900 persons and answered 37,330 calls for

assistance, involving a total property value of nearly \$1 billion, more than three times the Coast Guard's budget for the entire year. That's a pretty good return for the U.S. taxpayer on his dollar by this small service of approximately 31,500 officers and men.

But search and rescue is only one of many services rendered by the Coast Guard to Americans. As the chief U.S. agency for maritime safety and marine law enforcement, the Coast Guard has its work cut out for it. There is, for example, its extensive merchant marine safety program aimed at making the U.S. merchant fleet the best and safest in the world. Coast Guard inspectors resident in shipyards see to it that safety is built into every American vessel, emphasizing fire protection. Their concern extends from the blueprint stage, through the operating life of the vessel, to its final scrapping. That's why no fatal fire has occurred on any American-built passenger ship in more than a generation. It is also the reason that passengers on American-built ships rest a little easier.

In the rapidly growing field of recreational boating, Coast Guard boarding teams crisscross the States, making safety checks on the vast armada of recreational craft. Greatly facilitating the Coast Guard's work is the Coast Guard Auxiliary, a nonmilitary, voluntary organization operating throughout the Nation. Its flotillas can be found in such widely separated places as Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Yuma, Ariz.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Anchorage, Alaska; Dayton, Tenn.; and Stillwater, Minn.

Already the Coast Guard has assisted 45 States in setting up boating safety authorities. Work is now going forward to establish similar agencies in New Hampshire, Tennessee, Washington, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

With the approach of spring the Coast Guard is preparing for its relief work in areas annually endangered by floods. Together with other agencies, principally the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the American Red Cross, the Coast Guard goes about its humane task of alleviating suffering caused by this recurring phenomenon.

With increased use of America's waterways for the transportation of dangerous cargoes, the Coast Guard has intensified its efforts in this direction. Working closely with the Army's Corps of Engineers, and the Office of Emergency Planning, it helped to prevent disaster in the case of a barge heavily loaded with deadly chlorine gas tanks which sank in the Mississippi. More recently, the Coast Guard played an important part in preventing the ignition of a barge in the Chicago River, carrying highly flammable toluene. These are the disasters that didn't happen because of Coast Guard alertness and they can't be estimated in dollars.

Coast Guard icebreakers on the Great Lakes and on the major inland arteries of commerce, help keep shipping lanes open to industry most of the year. Without this vital service, commerce would be seriously impaired.

Few Americans know of the vast network of more than 42,000 navigation aids maintained by the Coast Guard in all the navigable waters of the United States. No one can estimate just how many accidents were averted because of these aids. In line with President Johnson's economy efforts, the Coast Guard is doing its best to modernize its aids system to provide better service at lower cost.

The Coast Guard's helping hand is extended not only to those in peril on the sea but also to victims of natural disasters such as floods. Mostly these occur in spring as rivers swollen with rain overflow their banks and sweep everything before them. The destructiveness of a river gone berserk is hard to imagine. When that happens the Coast

Guard is there to bring a measure of comfort to persons who have seen all their possessions carried away by the raging torrent.

One of the worst flood disasters occurred in October 1955 when, after 3 days of torrential rain, the Naugatuck and Housatonic Rivers in Connecticut spilled across a five State area, bringing havoc in their wake. Most seriously damaged by the disaster was Connecticut, especially the cities of Stamford, Croton, and Farmington. Other States affected were New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. For days a large contingent of Coast Guard personnel worked tirelessly to save the sick, the old, women and children, and anyone in need of help. Pressed into service was an armada of Coast Guard helicopters, amphibious vehicles, and small boats.

When the toll of the storm was finally reckoned, there were 42 dead, and 30,000 who had been made homeless. Without the all-out effort of the Coast Guard, the toll would undoubtedly have been much greater.

In June 1957, a flash flood smashed into the small community of Valley Park, about 15 miles south of St. Louis, Mo., forcing hundreds of residents to leave their homes and other possessions in areas flooded by the Merimac River. The flood resulted from a thunderstorm which struck at 7 p.m., Friday, June 14, and continued for 11 hours.

To meet the emergency, the Coast Guard pressed into service every coastguardsman in the vicinity of St. Louis. Because powerlines had been broken, a Coast Guard communications truck kept radio contact throughout flood operations.

Inside the Valley Park High School, Red Cross officials set up an emergency food service for both the rescued and the rescuers. Hundreds of elderly men and women were evacuated from the flood area by Coast Guard boats.

In the summer of 1951, exceptionally heavy rains turned the upper reaches of several midwestern rivers into raging torrents. Sweeping through Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and parts of Illinois, the floodwaters did an estimated \$1 billion in damage.

A prelude of what was to follow came when the Kaw (Kans.) River, a relatively small stream, was swollen by heavy rainfall, amounting to 7 inches an hour. Suddenly, swift waters of the Kaw, rising several feet an hour, smashed into North Topeka, destroying hundreds of fine homes and an extensive business district. As the waters backed into the eastern parts of the city, a call went out for Coast Guard men and equipment.

Within 3 hours, Coast Guard forces from the St. Louis area were at work. Throughout the night of July 12 and all through the next day they ran their boats continuously. They used M-2's, punts bracketed together in tandem, and powered by 22-horsepower outboard motors.

But it was in Kansas City that the Coast Guard did its most outstanding work. A total of 157 persons was rescued from positions of definite peril, and vast amounts of livestock and perishable foods were transported to safer ground or to places of need.

One of the most unusual tasks carried out by the Coast Guard was the evacuation of currency by the boatload from Kansas City. Coast Guard crews, accompanied by bank officials, removed several hundred thousand dollars from the Exchange National Bank in Kansas City.

Finally, the Kaw River, after cutting a swath of destruction through the industrial section of Kansas City, poured its silt-laden waters into the already swollen Missouri River.

Coast Guard men and equipment had already been dispatched to fight high waters at Alton, Ill., and at St. Charles, Mo. For 2 or 3 weeks, this new crest of the Missouri headed downstream. More men, boats, and radio

gear were moved into these two areas and a new unit was set up at Creve Coeur, Mo.

The muddy "Mo" was a formidable foe as it smashed through levee after levee with new-found power. Once again Coast Guard crews worked on a round-the-clock basis. They evacuated hundreds of persons along with the stock and personal possessions.

The situation eased a little as the floodwaters reached the Mississippi after setting the highest crest records in 104 years. Although the Mississippi was relatively low when the high waters of the Missouri came in, more than \$4 million in damage was caused along the industrial river front in St. Louis. As the flood receded, there was the heartbreaking job of cleaning up the remains of the disaster. Altogether, this was one of the most disastrous floods in our history.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Do I understand that this bill is \$21.5 million above the budget figure?

Mr. BONNER. That is an interesting item. The Coast Guard has been most economical and conservative in their requests of the Treasury. The Coast Guard requested of the Treasury the exact item of this total bill. The Treasury went over these thoroughly and approved the request of the Coast Guard. The matter then went to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget cut this amount.

There is no doubt whatsoever that these three vessels at this increased amount will provide a seriously needed requirement in order to carry out the functions that are necessary for the Coast Guard.

Mr. GROSS. I am not arguing with the gentleman as to the necessity for these three additional vessels. What concerns me is this: If I vote for this bill, am I going to be accused by the allegedly economically minded President of the United States with being a party to having exceeded his budget; in other words, will he put the responsibility on the Congress for having exceeded his budget figures? Incidentally, it is my opinion he has given us a budget figure that I think involves a lot of gimmickry.

Mr. BONNER. I do not think there could be any criticism whatsoever of the gentleman or anyone else who would read the report on this bill, which came out of the committee unanimously, and the hearings that justify the absolute need for the amount here. In fact, the amount ought to be more than it is. I do not know about the appropriations for other agencies, but I do know that this one has been woefully neglected.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quarreling with the views of the gentleman, I just want to know what position I am going to be in if I vote for this bill, that is \$21,500,000 above the budget. I do not want the President pointing his finger at me and saying, "You voted to exceed my budget." I wish I could have some assurance before the afternoon is over that this is not going to happen to the gentleman from Iowa. I agree with the gentleman that the Coast Guard performs

a very meritorious service and deserves modern equipment and facilities.

Mr. BONNER. Of course I cannot speak for the President, but knowing him as I do I do not believe, in this instance, he could with conscience point out any excessive, wasteful spending.

Mr. GROSS. I hope he has a conscience, and I am sure he does, but I still do not have an answer to my question. I hope someone will elucidate further before the afternoon is over.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. In response to the gentleman from Iowa, I think all the committee members were concerned with this when we went into this matter. But, after reading the hearings, I think the Congress must assert itself in the defense of this country. This authorization for the Coast Guard ties directly into the defense of the country. I am hopeful, as I am sure the gentleman is, that we can cut expenses in other areas. I am sure his own committee on Foreign Affairs is one area where he is going to be doing good work, and I would certainly support him.

As to this \$21,500,000, as the chairman says, we have neglected the Coast Guard year after year. Here is an opportunity to do a little something. We can cut in other areas. In that, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the distinguished ranking Member from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], of whom I am really fond and in whom I have the greatest confidence.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. There is a mutual-ity of feeling there.

I think the record should be corrected a little bit. I understood the gentleman from North Carolina to say that the original request from the Coast Guard was the same as contained in this bill. As I recall, the original request was greater than this. The original request for capital expenditure was something like \$112 million. The Bureau of the Budget requested the Coast Guard to cut that figure by \$40 million. We now have restored \$21,500,000.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am glad the gentleman corrected me. This restores 50 percent of the budget cut.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I agree with what the gentleman has said about the Coast Guard. I have had occasion along the New Jersey coastline to see it in operation. It is most efficient and it is most worthy of every consideration. However, I think that the Coast Guard errs on the side of economy. What the gentleman said about the Coast Guard economy is perfectly true. But down in the district that I represent in New Jersey we have quite a structure of Coast Guard installations.

The Coast Guard has come up with a proposition to close three of their sta-

tions along their coastline. If they close one station that I have in mind, it would leave a gap of 100 miles between two stations. In my opinion, that is unconscionable. I have seen that area devastated by tornadoes when upwards of 20 and 30 houses have been just blown and washed out to sea and if the Coast Guard had not been there, it would have involved a terrible loss of life.

Mr. BONNER. I agree with the gentleman. I, too, have had 10 or 12 Coast Guard stations closed in my congressional district. But at the present time we have more sympathy and more cooperation with respect to the Coast Guard and the Treasury Department than we have had in many years because the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and I some years ago went to see the Secretary of the Treasury and pointed out to him the deplorable condition of the Coast Guard with reference to the shortage of manpower and the lack of tools to carry out the responsibilities and the assignments that this House and this Congress has placed upon the Coast Guard. I hope we can look into the matter that the gentleman has pointed out and see if we cannot make some correction about it.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think the presentation made by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is an excellent one. I concur with most of what the gentleman from New Jersey has said. I am not critical of the Coast Guard for spending the money they have in an economical fashion. I am critical of the Congress for not giving them a sufficient amount of money to adequately perform their work.

I happen to represent the southwestern part of the State of Oregon which includes a long stretch of the Pacific Ocean coastline. I have visited a number of the Coast Guard stations and I know that they are operated on an economical basis, and I want them to continue to do so. But I have had the same complaint that the gentleman from New Jersey has just mentioned. There are vast stretches of coastal areas still unprotected, and it makes no more sense to me than it would to put a fire department in every other town or in every third town. I do not think anyone can argue that the loss of one single life or one single vessel does not cost more both in treasure and human suffering than the small amount of money that the Coast Guard spends in maintaining these facilities. As I say, I have had the same experience as the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out.

Recently, we reactivated the Coast Guard station at Bandon at the mouth of the Coquille River. That station is badly needed there. But in order to activate that station, they had to close the station at Port Orford leaving a big stretch of coastline unprotected.

I want to assure the gentleman of my support and I think the support of the entire delegation from the State of Oregon to provide such additional authorizations and appropriations as are necessary to bring the Coast Guard up to the point where it can do its job and do it well.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an appropriate time to pay tribute to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. It has been my privilege to serve with him ever since I first came to the Congress back in January of 1947. Throughout all of the years since that time I have known no man in this Congress who has been more concerned and interested in the welfare of the Coast Guard than the gentleman from North Carolina has been. Time and again he has expressed his concern about the deterioration of the facilities and equipment of the Coast Guard. He has invited members of our committee to visit many of the installations to see the facilities at first hand so that we could understand, as he understands, that the Coast Guard facilities were in fact deteriorating.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman most highly for his work in behalf of this wonderful department, the Coast Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I think the legislation we have before us today is a result of the gentleman's interest and activity.

I want also to commend the members of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], who is chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON]. They have all worked hard on this legislation.

For the information of the committee, may I say that this is the first legislative authority for appropriations for the Coast Guard that has come before the House for some 15 or 16 years.

In a law revision back in 1948-49—and I have forgotten the exact year—for some reason or other somebody overlooked the Coast Guard. From that time to this there has been no need for legislative authorization such as is required of the other departments of defense. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as you know, require authorization legislation which emanates from the Committee on Armed Services. As a matter of fact, we will have such a legislative authorization to come before us tomorrow from the Committee on Armed Services. This is the first time the House will have considered legislative authority for appropriations on the part of the Coast Guard since 1949. This comes about as a result of legislation introduced by our chairman a year or so

ago. Now for the first time in 15 years we are presenting legislative requests and authority, and I think this bodes well for the Coast Guard.

Heretofore the House itself has not had sufficient information about the requirements of the Coast Guard really to appropriate funds intelligently. The Coast Guard over the years since I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have always felt, was far too modest in its requests. I do not want to blame anybody down there or to criticize anybody, but I have said in our committee sessions on more than one occasion that I felt the Coast Guard was not sufficiently aggressive in its own interests. That picture seems to have changed now. I think it is as a result of a realization on the part of people in the Coast Guard, of course, principally, but also on the part of people in the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury himself has become concerned over the state of affairs so far as equipment and facilities are concerned in the Coast Guard.

I think the chairman of the committee and succeeding speakers will tell you about the equipment needs and the facility needs of the Coast Guard, so I will not need to go into it now except to say, as I indicated earlier, many members of the committee have seen at first hand the need for replacement not only of shoreside facilities but of the vessels which the Coast Guard operates. Normally the life expectancy of a vessel is 25 years. We used to hold to the figure of 20 years for many, many years, but a short time ago, several years ago, by legislative action for the first time so far as the merchant marine is concerned, we raised the life expectancy to 25 years. Most of the vessels in the Coast Guard by that standard are obsolete right now and should be replaced. The Coast Guard has a program of replacement which will run over a period of years, and it is hoped that by 1975 or perhaps even by 1970 the whole Coast Guard fleet will have been replaced.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], and the remarks of our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I should also like to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and also with my good friend the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

I have no question in my mind but that the Coast Guard has been neglected to a great degree. It has happened in the area which I represent and at the

various Coast Guard stations. They do not have any schedule of work hours. They are called at all hours of the night to work in the Great Lakes area in case of an S O S of some kind and they have done a terrific job of patrolling. I think they are worthy and certainly entitled to have the best equipment that Congress can afford to give them for carrying out their duties, because I do feel sincerely they have been neglected in the past.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] for yielding to me and I shall not trespass unduly on his time, especially so since I think the arguments in support of this legislation have already been well covered by previous speakers and by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

However, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which heard testimony on this bill, I want the RECORD to indicate my support. In previous years I have criticized the Treasury Department and the Coast Guard for failure to request adequate funds to provide for the needs and responsibilities of this important public service. There has never been full recognition given, in my opinion, to the ever-expanding duties of the Coast Guard. Its responsibilities are worldwide and it may surprise many people to learn that its operations cover every State in the Union. One only has to consider the increase in pleasure boating and water recreation to envisage the expansion of the Coast Guard's safety patrol responsibilities.

One important area where the lack of vessels and airplanes has been apparent has been in connection with the protection of our commercial fisheries, especially from Soviet fishing fleets. Also the increased oceanographic program has added to the already heavy burden of the Coast Guard. Likewise safety of life and air and sea rescue work requires modern airplanes and helicopters.

Altogether this authorization bill is modest in comparison with the needs and it is overdue because present vessels and airplanes of the Coast Guard are outdated and obsolete.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I support this legislation and urge Members to give it their favorable consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am interested in the report which refers to the acquisition of 63 new helicopters, "including 33 for new stations and 30 to increase the inadequate number at some existing stations."

Is there cooperation between the Navy air stations and the Army Air Force with respect to the use of helicopters in situations that might serve the need for helicopters used by the Coast Guard? This is a rather unusual number of new helicopters to be adding.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Let me say first that in this bill only 17 helicopters are

provided. The plan to which the report refers is the overall, long-range plan. There are only 17 helicopters in this bill. With respect to cooperation between the Coast Guard and other Department of Defense agencies I am not familiar as to the details. I must assume that they do cooperate, but I do not know that to be a fact.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman from Iowa, on page 5 of the report we find this:

The plan provides for a total of 41 replacements and 65 additional aircraft for the period 1962-66. The replacement program is on schedule and will be completed by the procurement of 14 medium helicopters, 9 of which are authorized herein, and 5 of which will be presented for consideration for fiscal 1966. When the nine covered herein are delivered those they replace will be 12 years old, which is 4 years beyond their normal service life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What I wanted to try to establish here is that we are not purchasing helicopters for the Coast Guard where helicopters and other craft might be available in ample supply in the armed services, if there is the proper cooperation between the Coast Guard and the armed services.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield to me?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has really brought up a pertinent question and made a pertinent observation. But he must remember that the responsibilities and the duties of the Coast Guard are one thing, the responsibilities and the duties of the armed services are another. The armed services have functions with ground troops and the fleet, and so forth. The Coast Guard has the responsibility of air and sea rescue.

I must say that the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Air Force have been most cooperative, because the Coast Guard simply does not have the tools to work with. In connection with disasters that have occurred on the Atlantic coast, the armed services have responded immediately and loaned their facilities for rescue and rehabilitation. There is no fuss between the two services, but I point out this, that the Coast Guard has lived on the crumbs that fall from the table of the air service in respect of planes and boats from the Navy. They fly planes and boats that you might call crates.

Mr. Chairman, I went out 50 miles on an 80-foot boat some time ago which was carrying supplies to a lightship. The crew was kept busy keeping this 80-footer afloat as they were operating it in an effort to deliver the supplies. It was a wooden vessel, which was a submarine vessel used during World War II.

Mr. GROSS. I want to respond to the necessity of the Coast Guard having to

have these items. I have no quarrel with their real necessities and the spending of money to provide for an adequate Coast Guard. But I just do not want to see them build up an air arm in the Coast Guard, if one is available in any of the branches of the armed services.

I note here that a helicopter station is to be established at Detroit, Mich. Apparently, the reason is an ever-increasing concentration of small pleasure boat activity in that area.

Well, I wonder if we are going to provide helicopters and planes, and what have you, for the benefit of the pleasure craft operators.

We are presently badly in debt in this country. The Federal debt is now \$309, \$310, or \$311 billion.

I wonder if we are entitled to go that far in taking care of the pleasure boat operators with aircraft to fly over them. I do not know exactly what they do in the matter of pleasure boating and what relationship there is of helicopters to pleasure boating, unless there is a disaster or an accident of some kind. But are we going to have helicopters flying over our State highways in order to take care of motorists who run out of gasoline, or what is the story?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Iowa makes an interesting observation because he was a good member and an active member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when we passed the Boating Act.

Without a doubt, the Boating Act was a bit unpopular at the time. However, it is very popular today, because it has taught individual citizens the dangers of the sea and the water.

Mr. Chairman, these helicopters are used for lifesaving purposes and rescue purposes. Their pilots are trained entirely different from aircraft and helicopter pilots who supply the ground forces of the Marine Corps, the Army, and the ships of the Navy. It is just a different category of the same machine.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] did make a good point and I think I should comment on it a little bit with respect to authorizing helicopters that we do not need because the Army and the Navy and the Air Force might have something available.

Actually, according to the statement of the Coast Guard people who appeared before our committee, this represents their minimum requirements.

The helicopters are used in a similar fashion to a fire engine being available at the fire station. They are available there in the event of an emergency. The Coast Guard cannot rely in an emergency upon an Army installation which might be located nearby. That Army installation at the particular moment might have its helicopters out on some other assignment. So, this is a minimum requirement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is happening—and the gentleman has heard some discussion along this line—is that a number of Coast Guard stations have been closed. The reason for this is the fact that helicopters have become more popular and effective as a means of

search and rescue than the boats used to be. While we are establishing some new helicopter stations, the Coast Guard, on the other hand, is eliminating a number of other stations. This, of course, represents a form of substituting or adding to the old form of the rescue system by the use of a helicopter system instead of a boat system.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that having heard from the Coast Guard representatives many, many times over the years, the request here is a minimum request, and I am satisfied it is, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I am very hopeful that very shortly this Congress will pass a law to provide a penalty against any foreign fishing vessels coming into our territorial waters such as the instance recently of the Cuban fishing vessels violating our territorial waters. I would expect that these very helicopters that we hope to authorize in this bill will patrol those waters and see that such vessels are kept out.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman from Washington. I believe that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] will probably tell us about the experiences of the Russian and Cuban fleets coming into shore in the Florida area.

I will tell you one instance where one of our Coast Guard boats took out after a Russian fishing vessel. They could not catch the fishing vessel. It pulled away from the Coast Guard because the Coast Guard vessel was inadequate and obsolete.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I represent a district in the Detroit metropolitan area, in Michigan, where the Air Detachment is to be established and where three helicopters are to be located. It is in that section around Detroit, in the vicinity of the Detroit River and Lake St. Clair. It has one of the heaviest concentrations in this country of small pleasure craft. As a result there are accidents, caused by explosions and many other reasons. These helicopters can get to a place of disaster much quicker to help out, and to perform rescues, rather than waiting for other vessels to get there. This has proven itself repeatedly on many, many occasions.

In addition to that, at this time of the year, a lot of our people go fishing on ice on Lake St. Clair, and other places. The ice breaks, and they are out on the ice floes. It is left up to the helicopters to perform the rescue. That also has happened on numerous occasions throughout the year. So I heartily approve this part of the program as well as the entire matter now before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently there is no reference to civil rights in this bill because if there was there would be more Members over here listening to the arguments and debate in connection with this pending \$93 million.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Will the gentleman withhold that point until I finish my comment?

Mr. GROSS. I withhold it.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I say that there are no civil rights involved here, of course. I would like to add, I may say to the gentleman, perhaps one reason there are not very many Members over here is because the Members have great confidence in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, last week there was no lack of Members over here to constitute a quorum.

I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Adair	Dulski	Miller, N.Y.
Ashley	Edmondson	Montoya
Ashmore	Elliott	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Finnegan	O'Konski
Barrett	Flynt	Powell
Bass	Forrester	Price
Battin	Gallagher	Rains
Berry	Gill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Goodell	Riehlman
Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Roberts, Ala.
Frances P.	Gubser	Roberts, Tex.
Bolton	Hanna	Roosevelt
Oliver P.	Hansen	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Harvey, Ind.	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	St. Onge
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Senner
Bruce	Hull	Sheppard
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Short
Burke	Kee	Sibal
Burkhalter	Kelly	Sickles
Burleson	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Kornegay	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	Leggett	Taft
Celler	Lesinski	Taylor
Clark	Lindsay	Tupper
Cohelan	Lloyd	Udall
Collier	McDowell	Van Deerlin
Colmer	McLoskey	Weaver
Cooley	Macdonald	Whitener
Corman	Madden	Williams
Cramer	Maillard	Willis
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Wyman
Diggs	Meador	Younger
Dowdy	Miller, Calif.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9640, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 332 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, all too many of us fail to

consider the number of ways in which the Coast Guard affects our lives.

We know, of course, that it operates an ice patrol to protect the world's ships from the fate that befell the *Titanic*. Some of us recall that it operates a line of weather ships across the Atlantic and the Pacific, whose function is to aid ships and aircraft in distress, furnish navigational aids for commercial and military airlines and weather observations for sea and air traffic.

Those of us who own any kind of boat are aware of its activities on all the navigable waters of the United States in enforcing safety regulations. We have seen its lighthouses and buoys on our rivers and oceans.

But in addition to all of these things, it affects us in many unseen ways. It maintains radio beacons and loran and other navigation systems to guide our commercial and military ships and planes. The loran network alone covers almost half of the globe and extends even as far as remote islands in the Philippines.

We have read recently about Coast Guard activities in intercepting Cuban vessels within the territorial waters of the United States and possibly we are aware that it maintains a constant patrol in the waters between the United States and Cuba, to prevent any international incidents involving that unhappy nation.

We Americans who have occasion to travel in ships have many reasons to be thankful for the Coast Guard in its activities designed for their protection. Any ship built in the United States must have its building plans approved by the Coast Guard and after its construction it is subject to regular Coast Guard inspections to assure that all of the safety devices are functioning and that the vessel in general is in a seaworthy condition. Its officers and men must possess licenses issued by the Coast Guard certifying their competency to fulfill their duties.

In cases involving marine disasters, the Coast Guard is our first line of defense. It maintains in New York a computer-controlled vessel reporting system by which over 90 percent of American merchant vessels and 65 percent of foreign vessels constantly report their positions so that in the case of a disaster the nearest rescue vessels can be immediately determined and dispatched to the scene.

This morning's New York Times reports two instances of Coast Guard activity in the Atlantic. A British freighter has gone down in the North Atlantic and a Coast Guard plane has dropped three life rafts near the scene.

At the same time, an earthquake in the Azores has resulted in a call for help relayed through the commander of the U.S. forces in the Azores requesting a list of ships available for evacuating the inhabitants of one of the islands. The Coast Guard vessel reporting system in New York was able to give him the location and call letters of 74 vessels within 400 miles of the area.

In addition, of course, it maintains a fleet of helicopters and short- and long-range fixed-wing aircraft to function in

situations involving search and rescue on the bays and oceans, as well as its fleet of cutters and smaller patrol craft to rescue victims of the sea.

Most Coast Guard activities are unheralded, and I am afraid that it is guilty of far too high a degree of modesty in announcing its accomplishments. The result is the present state of its equipment, which not only presents a possibility of danger to the devoted men who must operate it, but also to the general public in that its ability to perform its functions may be impaired through breakdown or inadequacy of equipment to do its work.

During the conduct of the hearings on this bill I was greatly impressed by the overwhelming need for equipment to replace that which is presently overage and obsolete and I am convinced that every dollar sought to be authorized by this bill is vitally necessary for its success. It is my hope that this represents a start in the rehabilitation of Coast Guard equipment to the end that it may continue its great service to virtually all of us in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my remarks I include the following items from the press:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1964]

QUAKES ROCK AZORES ISLE; REMOVAL OF 20,000 STARTS

LAJES AIRBASE, THE AZORES, February 18.—Ships began removing the 20,000 inhabitants of São Jorge Island in the Azores tonight, while planes at this U.S. Air Force base were alerted for a possible airlift duty if continuing earthquake shocks on the island grow worse.

Tremors have rattled the little Portuguese island for the last 3 days, causing panic among the population and tumbling São Jorge's older buildings. No casualties have been reported.

The tremors are succeeding one another in increasing intensity and frequency, islanders reported by radio. At least 47 houses have collapsed.

The harbormaster of Angra do Heroísmo, on Terceira Island diverted several vessels to São Jorge by radio, and they began loading terrified evacuees.

LAVA ERUPTION FEARED

Residents were afraid that the quake might awaken a dormant volcano and spill molten lava throughout the area.

[In New York the Coast Guard reported receiving an appeal for help, broadcast by the Horta radio Tuesday. It was relayed by the commander of U.S. forces in the Azores and said: "Suffering great earthquake. Important damage * * * many ruins. Request all navigation available proximity this island render assistance." The Coast Guard radioed back the location and call letters of 74 vessels within 400 miles of the island.]

The British cable ship *Mirror* of the Cable and Wireless Co. put out from Horta harbor for São Jorge carrying two doctors, a nursing staff, medical supplies, bread, flour, and tents.

A ship left Angra do Heroísmo today carrying 17 ambulances with blood plasma for São Jorge Island, to be ready should the quakes cause wholesale casualties.

Two U.S. Navy tugs stood by in Praia da Vitoria harbor on Terceira Island. They were to put to sea to be available in case of any volcanic disaster on any other of the nearby islands.

COMPUTER TRACKS VESSELS

The working heart of the Atlantic merchant vessel report system is a computer at the 3d Coast Guard District office in the U.S. customs house here.

The system, which covers all the Atlantic Ocean north of the Equator, keeps track of the hour-by-hour positions of more than 800 vessels plying the North Atlantic searoutes.

These vessels regularly report their position, course, speed, destination, and estimated time of arrival at their destination. This information is transferred first to punch cards, then to magnetic tape and fed into the computer.

On command, the computer can type out a list of all the ships in a given area. Then the Coast Guard can radio to those ships requests for help in any emergency. This was the method used in locating rescue ships for the Azores earthquake.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1964]
THIRTY-FIVE ABANDON BRITISH FREIGHTER IN ATLANTIC GALE; LIFERAFTS DROPPED BY AIR TO CREW OF HELPLESS VESSEL 660 MILES OFF HALIFAX

(By Werner Bamberger)

A gale on the North Atlantic battered the British freighter *Ambassador* into a helpless hulk yesterday and may have taken the lives of some of her crew of 35.

Incomplete reports from the Italian liner *Leonardo da Vinci*, standing by the stricken freighter downwind at a point 660 miles southeast of Halifax, said that no survivors were seen on the first of three liferafts that were dropped from the air by a Coast Guard plane. The scene is 1,200 miles east of New York.

At a late hour last night the Italian luxury liner reported that she was investigating a second liferaft. The ship also informed the Coast Guard that one man was still believed aboard the 443-foot British vessel, which was abandoned by her crew at 2:50 p.m.

Capt. Oscar Ribari, master of the 33,340-ton luxury liner, notified the Italian line office here that the seas were the worst he had ever encountered.

Coast Guard sources expressed doubt that the Italian liner would be able to launch one of her own lifeboats in such high seas to pick up the British seamen.

The 10,270-ton *Ambassador* was sailing from Philadelphia to London with a full cargo of 9,516 long tons of wheat and corn. At 6:47 a.m. she sent an S O S saying that her engines were dead and that she was listing heavily to port.

The Italian liner inbound from the Mediterranean with 754 passengers was 50 miles away at the time. At 12:21 p.m. the *Leonardo* sent a message that she had sighted the stricken British vessel.

Two aircraft—a Canadian Argus and a Coast Guard C-130—stood guard overhead. The C-130, piloted by Lt. Clyde E. Robbins, dropped three liferafts.

At 3:30 p.m. Lieutenant Robbins sent a message that he had observed the *Ambassador's* crew abandoning ship. An hour or so later, the Canadian plane sent word that one liferaft, holding seven men, had overturned.

The seven seamen, however, were able to right the raft and reboard it, the message added.

The *Ambassador* was foundering at a point in the Atlantic where, according to the Weather Bureau, the Gulf Stream keeps the water temperature at 62°. At this temperature, it was said, a man can survive in the water from 2 to 40 hours, depending on his physical condition.

The violence of the wind and waves was underscored by word from the West German merchant ship *Carl Trautwein*, which was also 50 miles from the scene.

The 16,850-ton vessel first reported she was unable to make a 180° turn to head toward the *Ambassador* and later reported to the Coast Guard that she was standing still against 50-knot winds and angry seas.

Also ordered to the scene was the 311-foot Coast Guard cutter *Coos Bay*. The cutter was 450 miles away.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN].

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, of the five branches of our military service, the U.S. Coast Guard has for years been the most neglected, both by administrations and by the Congress. I do not know why this is so.

For years we have let this very fine organization perform its duties with ships and equipment that are very much overage and in need of replacement. For instance, of the 25 light ships now in service, 11 are over 40 years old, and there is no question but that replacement of these vessels is vitally urgent, not only to enable the Coast Guard to perform its assigned duties, but even for the safety of the personnel aboard, and this is only one incident.

In times of war it has been the Coast Guard that has been called upon to immediately transport the necessary personnel and equipment, which has put them in the front lines of every one of our wars. Their peacetime duties have been expanded, not only by the growth of our population and economy, but because of the duties necessitated by our country becoming the leader in the Western World. Even though neglected, they have always been ready.

Not only does the Coast Guard patrol the coastal waters of the United States proper, including the Atlantic, the gulf, the Pacific Coast, and the Great Lakes, but also the entire coastal areas of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Guam, and it even maintains installations in the Trust Territories of the South Pacific, and areas throughout the world.

The word "Coast Guard" today is really a misnomer. For instance, under the 14th Coast Guard District, with groups and district units located in the Hawaiian Islands, there are also maintained air, loran, and radio stations and facilities at a number of islands in the Mariana and Caroline groups, in the Philippines, and in Japan and Korea, with its offshore islands of Okinawa and Iwo Jima. It has air detachments in Newfoundland and Bermuda for covering the North Atlantic Ocean.

Further, the Coast Guard maintains a Mediterranean section with an air station at Naples, Italy, and loran stations throughout the Mediterranean area all the way from Turkey to Spain.

It must, of necessity, complement performance of its duties with Coast Guard aircraft, and the use of the helicopter is becoming more and more practical in sea rescue work as well as in patrol duties. With the rapid advancement in the development of this type of aircraft, the present helicopter fleet of the Coast Guard is in need of replacement of the older models as well as enlargement from the standpoint of both safety and overall economy. A recent study has indicated that many surface Coast Guard stations can be closed out and the patrolling of the areas and rescue duties incumbent thereby can be performed by helicopters much more proficiently and economically. This is particularly true in the areas

of high-density boating and commercial fishing.

We all know of the wonderful work which the Coast Guard has performed for years in the field of iceberg patrol, but it is not as well known that the Coast Guard maintains long-range search and rescue patrols from ocean station positions, with six deepwater locations which are continuously manned along the transoceanic air routes, completely equipped for meteorological, air-navigation, and communication services, in addition to rendering search and rescue assistance as part of a system established by the International Civil Aviation Organization. The ships used are the 350-foot, 2,700-ton, high-endurance vessels. It is the opinion of our committee that this authorization bill should include two of this type ship instead of one, as the administration in its so-called economy program requested. The present ships of this type in service are all suffering from the deficiencies of age, affecting the equipment and machinery, and even the hulls, with 6 already over 25 years old and the remainder will be at least 25 years old by 1971. These ships must stand the ravages of the North Atlantic in the worst kind of winter weather when on duty station, and I have always marveled how these ships and these men perform their assigned duties when we read of the great ocean liners being buffeted by storms with waves 40 to 50 feet high, which bring them into port hours or days late, sometimes even with damaged superstructures.

I am sure we all remember reading of the Greek steamship *Laconia* catching on fire and sinking on a cruise trip from England to the Madeira Islands, and it is a matter of record that two of our Coast Guard cutters, the *Echo* and the *Delta*, received the first S O S and immediately started for the location to effect rescue, but with other ships being closer, they were not needed. But, our Guard cutters in their patrol duties were ready and available, and during this emergency relayed not only the original disaster message from the *Laconia* to their Search and Rescue Headquarters in New York, but for quite a time were the relaying stations for all traffic between the *Laconia* and search and rescue vessels which were close to the scene of the tragedy.

The testimony before our committee indicates that not only is much replacement and repair of ship facilities necessary, but at the shore installations as well, much work needs to be done.

I do not think there is a Member of this body who will disagree with me when I say that the money we spend in maintaining and equipping the U.S. Coast Guard is money well spent.

Please remember also that the Coast Guard has supervision over safety in the use of our lakes and inland waterways, and a year or so ago when I visited the captain of the port of the Coast Guard station at Chicago, he told me that he has increasing fear every year at the commencement of the summer boating season. The large populated areas on our waterfronts are almost as densely congested with pleasure boats

of all sizes as are the highways with automobiles, and it is the duty of the Coast Guard to watch over them in fair weather and foul. This is in addition to its many other shoreside duties of enforcing Federal laws at every port of entry, as well as supervising all merchant marine safety on all ships entering and leaving our ports and harbors.

Under the chairmanship of our very capable colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, the Subcommittee on Coast Guard spent several days in hearings with Admiral Roland, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and his staff. Admiral Roland presented a very detailed program for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and for the construction of shore facilities, as presented in this bill. In my opinion, it is a modest request, and there is nothing in this bill that is not absolutely necessary for the continuation of the services which we demand and expect of our Coast Guard.

Of particular interest to me as a representative of a coastal area in which two of our Coast Guard stations are about to be deactivated, is the program for helicopters, and which Admiral Roland pointed out we are neglecting. With respect to additional helicopters and helicopter stations, he said that modern helicopters—the procurement of 17 of which are proposed in this bill—promised the greatest advance since radio in improving search and rescue performance with instrument flight capability and range, and endurance equal to the demands of the great majority of rescue jobs. These craft have already proven themselves capable of producing a real reduction in the time of rescue in a wide variety of situations, and please remember that “time of rescue” is a very good measure of chance of survival.

With the addition of these new helicopters and planned new helicopter stations along the coast, Admiral Roland pointed out that rescue capability in the great majority of instances can be reduced to within 1 hour.

Just recently, in my own district, surface rescue craft could not get out to sea because of the icy conditions in the waterways in answering a call for aid by a disabled ship, but the Coast Guard helicopter rescued the persons aboard the ship without too much difficulty, and brought them safely to port. This with the weather bad and 10-foot-high seas running, so I am convinced that helicopters can not only go where surface craft cannot, but in all kinds of weather as well.

In conclusion, may I state that not only do I support this bill wholeheartedly, but I also desire to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Maryland, Chairman GARMATZ, for the kind and considerate cooperation which he extends to all members of this subcommittee in both public hearings and executive session, and I am indeed honored to serve on this committee with him as our chairman.

I would like also to commend the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman BONNER, and ranking minority member,

the gentleman from Washington, Congressman TOLLEFSON, for the contribution which they made in these hearings as ex officio members of the subcommittee. The House is fortunate in having men of their caliber and experience as chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my words of endorsement and full support to the statements made by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman BONNER, chairman of our full committee, and the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman GARMATZ, chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, which held extensive hearings on this measure to authorize the construction of shore and offshore establishments and for the procurement of vessels and aircraft for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Coming as I do from coastal North Carolina—an area of significance to commercial water transportation, the fisheries, and recreational boating activities—I have been familiar with the Coast Guard and its functions for many more years than I have served in the Congress. In the 8 years I have served in this House I have been privileged to serve continuously as a member of the subcommittee having responsibility for the Coast Guard. I have interested myself in the affairs of the agency. I have been named seven times as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

The Coast Guard today is a far cry from its origins when the Revenue Cutter Service was established by the first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, in 1790 to control smuggling in the early years of our Republic. Its roles and missions have evolved and grown with our Nation until now—as has already been stated—it performs important functions in virtually every State. Since those early beginnings the law enforcement activity in the Coast Guard has continued to grow. It is now responsible for enforcing or assisting in the enforcement of Federal laws on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. These laws govern navigation, shipping and other maritime operations and the related protection of life and property. In addition to its own enforcement responsibility, the Coast Guard has become the enforcement agent for other Government departments and agencies, covering such diverse responsibilities as the loading of dangerous cargo; enforcement of neutrality laws; enforcement of oil pollution acts; enforcement of treaty regulations for the protection of halibut; enforcement of the Fur Seal Act, the Whaling Convention Act and sockeye salmon fisheries and other fishery matters. It works with the Atomic Energy Commission regarding the disposal of nuclear waste at sea. Negotiations are underway regarding procedures for the inspection of nuclear-powered vessels.

The Coast Guard coordinates and provides maritime search and rescue facilities for marine and air commerce and for the Armed Forces. Other functions in-

clude promoting the safety of merchant vessels, furnishing icebreaking services to keep navigation open in the winter-time, and to support important national interest projects in the Arctic and Antarctic. The agency is responsible for developing, installing, maintaining, and operating maritime aids to navigation. This briefly outlines the year-in, year-out peacetime function of the Coast Guard.

But it has another and great responsibility for maintaining a state of readiness to function as a specialized service of the Navy in time of war or national emergency, when, as in World War II it bore heavy burdens with an outstanding record, including extensive combat participation.

In the past few years the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has become increasingly concerned over the capability of the Coast Guard to continue to carry out effectively its heavy responsibilities. Hearings touching on various aspects of its program disclosed serious deficiencies in its capital plant and equipment. Its vessels were found to be inadequate in number, obsolete, and even unsafe. These revelations suggested the desirability of providing for authorization legislation as a prerequisite to annual appropriations for the procurement of such major items as vessels and aircraft and the construction of major shore and offshore establishments and facilities. Such legislation was enacted last year.

As the first authorization bill, H.R. 9640, came before us in January of this year and hearings were held upon it, it became clear to our committee that we must proceed without delay in replacing and building up this vital arm of our peacetime and wartime strength. The hearings disclosed grave deficiencies.

Considering the overall needs of the service, the proposal that came before us was too modest. And, as has already been said, we felt constrained to amend the measure by authorizing one more high-endurance cutter and two more medium-endurance cutters than were requested. Other increases would surely have been justified, but recognition had to be taken of the strain on the overall Federal budget.

It is my hope that the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget will immediately begin to seek ways of adjusting next year's authorization request so as to accelerate the pace of the replacement and development program of the Coast Guard.

With the world in the state it is in today; with the increased overseas transportation by sea and air; with the frequent incursions of alien vessels into our fisheries and territorial waters; and with the increased significance of oceanography to the security and economy of this country, we cannot afford to neglect our duties in providing for this essential service.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Just so that I may have a correct understanding and that

the record may be clear, I had stated earlier, when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], had the floor, that the original request from the Coast Guard for capital outlay was some \$112 million, and the Bureau of the Budget cut that \$40 million. Also, that the Bureau of the Budget cut about \$40 million from the total requested. Now, when the gentleman from North Carolina uses the figure of \$130 million, does he mean to include items in addition to the capital items which he mentioned?

Mr. LENNON. I do not include the \$13.5 million, which is not in this authorization bill, but which represents continuing authorizations that the Coast Guard now has for projects that have been previously authorized under the former long-range authorization program.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If the gentleman will yield further, in any event the total suggested cut or the total cut by the Bureau of the Budget was \$40 million?

Mr. LENNON. That is true.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And in this bill we propose to restore \$21.5 million of that amount?

Mr. LENNON. That is true.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, practically everything has been said here that can be said for the Coast Guard. All of us who have had the privilege of working both on the full committee and on the subcommittee which is so ably chaired by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], are aware of the importance of the function of the Coast Guard. However, I think we have overlooked one important thing about the Coast Guard as far as its value and use to this great country. That is its military capability in time of national emergency or in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard, perhaps, represents our greatest pool of highly skilled, highly trained men of the sea. In time of war the mission of the U.S. Coast Guard becomes greatly expanded. Therefore, any capital improvements, any expansion of the facilities of the Coast Guard in time of peace, represents a direct and significant contribution to our total defense capability.

Mr. Chairman, I believe another point that can be made in an argument for this bill is that the mission of the Coast Guard is constantly changing. The number of fishing vessels of other nations—some friendly and some not so friendly—which have invaded our coastal waters since World War II has been staggering. In fact, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has pointed out so many times from this very well, Russian trawlers and Cuban trawlers have virtually nosed into the beaches of his State of Florida. The Coast Guard has a direct and a growing mission to patrol these areas. To enforce existing laws and international agreements affecting the use of our coastal areas by foreign vessels.

Mr. Chairman, it seems a shame to me that any of our weather ships should be obsolete. These long-range high-endurance cutters are essential not only for

modern long-range navigational assistance for aircraft, but also they represent important eyes and ears covering distant areas of the sea. They tell us what is going on far beyond our shores. I do not believe we have a single one of these high-endurance cutters that was actually built for that purpose, or that could be called a truly modern ship.

Mr. Chairman, for us to neglect the Coast Guard, it is the most shortsighted thing we could do in terms of developing our national defense, our commerce of the sea, our ability to communicate, our ability to traverse the world with adequate navigational devices and our ability to preserve life and limb of our people.

Mr. Chairman, it is important I believe that we also consider the law enforcement side of the Coast Guard. A great deal of their energy and resource goes into this effort.

I feel that although we are here taking our prerogative and adding to an overall budget I think that the Congress is justified in spending this money. The people of this Nation will receive many, many times over a dollar's worth for every dollar spent.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my colleagues in commending the chairman and ranking member of our committee for the attention they have given this particular problem and for the urgency with which all of the committee members have dealt with the need for increased support of the Coast Guard.

I had occasion to inspect the Coast Guard facilities in Florida within the past 10 days. I do not think there is any service supported by this Government that does as much with the equipment, with the manpower and the budget limitation that the Coast Guard does. It is amazing to see the responsibility that they have, and just how it is carried out. Each Member of this Congress should take the time to study the duties of the Coast Guard and also to look at the equipment, much of it obsolete, much of it which we would not dare let the Army, the Air Force, or the Navy use. Simply because it is a peacetime mission, so to speak, we let it go obsolete, we let it go undermanned and underfinanced. It is time for the Congress to change that situation.

Speaking about this equipment, you can go right on down the line. With reference to the high endurance cutters, six of them are 25 years old and obsolete. Others have an average of 20 years. There are the medium endurance cutters, of which we have 30—18 are 30 years old—25 years is the cutoff time for obsolescence. In coastal tenders, of which there are 26, 11 are obsolete. You can go right on down the list, and obsolescence is always apparent.

In the 7th Coast Guard District in Florida, for instance, it covers an area which starts up in North Carolina. It goes down the Florida coast and the Gulf coast to Yucatan, then right on down to South America, and it goes over to San Juan. Do you know how many

men this one district has to patrol and carry out law enforcement and sea rescue work in this area?—2,300 men. No wonder we cannot properly patrol the coast of this country. We are spending \$50 billion a year for the defense of the United States, and yet, we find we have along our own coast of Florida, New England, and the west coast, Russian trawlers and Cuban fishing vessels penetrating the territorial waters of the United States. I ask, how much good is it going to do to spend \$50 billion to protect our people when we are not giving adequate surveillance and protection to the shores close to the heartland of our country?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who is a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee that looked into this trawler problem, and who did a magnificent job.

Mr. PIKE. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida for the perseverance and determination he has shown in making this Congress face up to this issue. I want to commend him also on what he is saying with reference to this item of money that is being spent. I would like to bring this in perspective. We are involved here with a bill totaling \$93 million for all the procurement of the Coast Guard and all of the construction of the Coast Guard. Tomorrow we are going to be considering a bill which has \$92 million, almost exactly the same amount added to it for research and development on two different aircraft only.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I believe he has put this in proper perspective. Think of it, research just for two airplanes for the armed services will total the entire amount of what we are asking to equip the Coast Guard.

I do blame somebody. There have been statements on the floor that we do not know where to place the blame. I know where to place the blame. Because the Coast Guard has been too timid in asking for what it really needs, and the Treasury Department has been too timid, and the Secretary of the Treasury has not given this adequate attention, or this condition would never have been allowed to exist.

I think it is high time for Mr. Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, to devote some attention to this problem. I think it is time for Mr. Dillon to come to the Congress with sufficient requests in order to bring up to date the facilities and the manpower and the equipment of the Coast Guard, so that they can handle the job for which they are responsible.

Let me point out to you a few things about these Russian trawlers and these Cuban fishing vessels that we are going to see more and more of as this problem develops. It is not just a Florida problem. It starts up on the northeast coast of our country, where they have a Russian fleet of 400 to 500 ships. We have pictures of these ships. These trawlers come down the east coast and pass off Florida. We have had them on

the west coast, along with Japanese vessels. We also have them on all sides of our country and the Coast Guard is given the responsibility of surveillance and job of doing something about it.

May I bring to your attention an unclassified document put out by the U.S. Navy from the Office of the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, entitled "Atlantic Fleet Trawler Recognition Guide," which was published shortly after the hearings by the Armed Services Committee on Special Investigations which went into the trawler problem last year. This document has pictures of Russian trawlers. Let me read this. This is in a Government publication, issued by the Navy.

The Soviets, for the past 2 years, have maintained at least one trawler designed for intelligence collection off the east coast of the United States on a continuous basis.

Do you know how you can tell the difference between the Russian trawler that is used as an intelligence ship and the Russian trawler that is simply fishing?

The Russian intelligence trawlers usually carry two HF-DF loops, which may be located on top of the bridge and atop one of the two masts, or one on each mast.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Could the gentleman assure me before I vote for this bill that none of these new cutters will be used to stop the anti-Communist infiltrators from going into Cuba? Can the gentleman give me some assurance on that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I cannot assure the gentleman of that. As the gentleman knows, it is official Government policy that they do not expect raids on Cuba to be mounted from this country. I thought at the time this policy was not unreasonable. They have no restriction on mounting raids on Cuba from other parts of Central and Latin America. But this has been the policy on Cuba, and I think it has some merit. So until that policy is changed, there could be no assurance which I can give the gentleman, although I have concern about the problem.

Mr. STINSON. There is no intention by increasing the number of cutters of stepping up the activity against the anti-Communist raiders?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am not sure about what is being done along those lines. What we are concerned with is the protection of the United States. It is the duty of the Coast Guard to get after these trawlers and the Cuban vessels. I think we have moved them along into a position where we have them under control. We have just had an example of it. Here is a picture of the Cuban vessels that have just been picked up. Incidentally, they are very new ships and very capable ships.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my tribute to the very capable, conscientious, and fearless chairman of our full committee and also the chairman of the subcommittee, the

gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], as well as our ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

When I stand here and advocate increased Government spending, it is an event. I only trust that the Capitol dome will not disintegrate as I stand here.

The Coast Guard, in my opinion, has been a second or third cousin entirely too long. It is called upon to perform more varied duties than probably any of the other services. It is constantly getting additional duties. This morning in hearings on the bill that we were considering, I heard some rather significant statements and I want to read just a few of these:

Five years ago no large fishing fleets operated off the U.S. coast with the exception of the Bering Sea. Last year there were over 200 large, modern, foreign fishing vessels off our Atlantic coast while at the same time approximately 300 foreign vessels were in Alaska waters including the Gulf of Alaska.

I consider the following a very pertinent statement:

During the last 8 months 16 foreign vessels have been officially sighted by the U.S. Navy or the Coast Guard in territorial waters within our 3-mile limit off Alaska.

Now I cite these statements to show that the duties of the Coast Guard are increasing all the time.

Following Admiral Roland's testimony before our committee, I suggested to the admiral, I trusted that the personnel he commands is not as obsolete and antiquated as much of the equipment he has.

I want to cite just a few places where there are distinct needs.

In Elizabeth City, N.C., the Coast Guard has its largest aviation activity. One runway there is 23 years old and it must be rebuilt for safety reasons. 20 to 25 percent of the concrete slabs there are either sunken or rather badly tilted.

On Annette Island in southern Alaska, we have conducted air operations for approximately 16 years. They never have had adequate housing facilities. At the present time they are using World War II quonset huts and this detracts from the desirability of assignment and it does make for serious morale problems. In the admiral's words:

Conditions there are horrible. It is particularly bad since in the very same location, other Government employees have good and desirable housing.

This good and desirable housing was furnished by the Government.

In San Juan, P.R., we have 70 officers and men and 4 aircraft.

This installation is now located on a naval station which is scheduled to close, and here the Coast Guard must become self-sufficient. In Wilmington, N.C., the pier is so badly deteriorated that repairs there are no longer feasible.

In Mayport, Fla., the Coast Guard is now using naval facilities which are wholly inadequate for both services.

On Sitkinak, an island off Alaska, there is an installation which is supported almost entirely by air. The runway there is made of local material which is coarse-ground gravel which cannot be compacted. This creates a real hazard for our aircraft at that station.

I was going to comment on the Coast Guard Academy, but the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] has already done that. From the information I have the Coast Guard Academy definitely must be expanded. It is not receiving the same consideration as similar academies. I could cite many more instances of dire need. I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of our committee, made a very significant statement following Admiral Roland's testimony to the committee. This is what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] said:

Admiral, this is anything but a bright picture of the physical status of the Coast Guard at the present time.

I do want to congratulate the Coast Guard for the commendable job it is doing with very inadequate and obsolete equipment. Something needs to be done, and we in this Congress need to face up to our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, about 3 or 4 days each week I walk past one of the largest Coast Guard installations in this country. This base is located on Staten Island in New York City. I also observe the Coast Guard Base on Manhattan Island, New York, several times weekly. It is apparent to me and to everyone who observes these Coast Guard yards that not only are the yard facilities inadequate for the mission these people have to perform, but the ships and the equipment are also inadequate. I think that the previous gentlemen, from the chairman of the committee right on down to the chairman of the subcommittee, have concurred in the fact that this appropriation is a modest request on behalf of the Coast Guard and entirely necessary to enable them to fulfill their mission. I would say it is only due to the high quality of the personnel in the Coast Guard and their efficiency that they carry out their many missions as well as they have.

I would like to state that at the present time before several committees of the Congress there is legislation to extend the responsibilities of the Coast Guard from the 3-mile limit in our territorial waters out to the 12-mile limit. This will create a greater burden on patrolling for the Coast Guard. I think unless we act now and approve the replacement of the already obsolescent vessels, we are going to have problems in expecting the Coast Guard to properly fulfill its mission.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I certainly will.

Mr. CHELF. I want to take this opportunity to commend and compliment this great committee that has come to this floor today with this information. I am appalled and I am shocked to hear our defenses insofar as our Coast Guard is concerned are at such an alltime low. The only trouble is and the only fault I find with you boys is that you are just

not asking for double the amount. I am for you all the way, boys.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER].

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], the ranking minority member, for their deep concern and interest in this very important service and security branch.

Mr. Chairman, my State of New York has many rivers and lakes. It does not boast extensive maritime coasts, generally; but Nassau and Suffolk Counties, parts of which I represent, have many hundreds of miles of beaches fronting on ocean, bays, rivers, and inlets.

The south shore of Long Island has a long history of maritime incidents beginning with the days of the Life Saving Service and through the years of the existence of the Coast Guard. The heroism, the courage, the day-to-day dutiful dedication of the Coast Guard is a shining light in the story of New York.

The story of this great branch of service is not autobiographical. The Coast Guard does not blow its own horn. It has no Madison Avenue public relations techniques. It just drives along in its great tradition, doing its job.

It was to me a great shock, as it was to others on the subcommittee on Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee generally, to find the deterioration and obsolescence of the equipment and facilities of the Coast Guard so far advanced.

It is extremely important that immediate steps be taken to reprogram the Coast Guard with the very best possible equipment, and H.R. 9640 is a step in the right direction to keep "Semper Paratus" in the Coast Guard motto.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this legislation. I wish to commend the Coast Guard for the fine work done by all elements of this fine organization.

The facilities and equipment set forth in this authorization bill are seriously needed and will do much to assist in even better service to the coastal areas of the country and in the security of these areas.

I do, however, wish to express the concern of those of us deeply interested in the coastal areas of Maine relative to the closing of facilities on the Maine coast. We feel that these closings will impair service to our Maine fishery industry and service to the recreational use of the area.

We have voiced our protests but the facilities are being closed.

We shall expect the Coast Guard to be doubly certain that these changes will not reduce vital service on the Maine coast.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I represent Cape Cod where we first sighted these tremendous armadas of Russian fishing vessels. Last summer I flew over one of these fleets, which was operating a few miles out beyond Nantucket. It stretched from horizon to horizon, and convinced me that we very definitely need the Coast Guard to maintain surveillance over their operations.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, in the last 5 years, besides the advent of hundreds of Russian fishing vessels off our coasts, there has been the advent of thousands of small boats in Buzzards Bay and a similar boom in boating in recreational areas throughout the country. In Massachusetts, as recently as 3 years ago we had less than 30,000 small boats. Now we have more than 80,000 registered in Massachusetts. These need the Coast Guard's services. For the pleasure boat operator, often very inexperienced, quick and reliable service can spell the difference in many cases between life and death.

An editorial in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., recently commented on the plight that can befall the small boat operator and the resultant need for the Coast Guard. I would like to quote a paragraph that sets a scene familiar to almost anyone who has ever found himself at the mercy of the unpredictable sea in a small boat:

When those sudden fogs make each boat an island in white nothingness and afternoon williwaws churn in from the southwest, it is the assurance of the nearby Cuttyhunk's Coast Guard that keeps the helmsman under control.

And it is the prompt, maneuverable readiness of the Cuttyhunk rescue craft to answer every type of call that has saved many a disabled boating party from distress or even disaster.

The Coast Guard has curtailed its activities in many coastal areas, recognizing perhaps diminishing commercial requirements. Our fishing vessels have become quite reduced in number lately, as they compete with the flood of foreign imports. We must recognize this increase in the number of small boats, in the recreational activities, and in the fact that we need to extend the service particularly in the summertime to make certain that these men and women and their children have the protection to which they are entitled.

May I point out in conclusion, that there is one bright spot on the scene with reference to our fishing fleet. We have increased the scalloping operation considerably out of the city of New Bedford. These scallopers need the services which are provided by offshore cutters.

So, in all, as has been said by the previous speakers, we must recognize the Coast Guard's changing and increasing responsibilities.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of the U.S. Coast Guard have multiplied many times in the last few years, yet Coast Guard budgets have not increased in any direct proportion.

It would be difficult to name a single Federal agency of Government giving comparable service to the American taxpayer for the tax dollars allocated to it.

The U.S. Coast Guard is handicapped by being a branch of the U.S. Treasury Department instead of the Department of Defense. The Coast Guard, sensitive to the Treasury Department's desire to set an example for frugality, submits budget requests far too modest to meet their actual needs. Incongruously, these lean requests are then customarily pared down still lower by the Bureau of the Budget.

To add to the dilemma of this oldest seagoing service, there is a deplorable lack of public information throughout much of the country concerning the various duties prescribed for the Coast Guard. Many unfortunately think of it in vague terms as sort of an auxiliary of the U.S. Navy. Of course nothing is further from the truth.

Anyone living along the coastal areas of our Nation knows that it is the Coast Guard that is looked to when a boat is missing or in distress. The search and rescue mission of the Coast Guard has risen dramatically due to the tremendous increase in private boating in the United States.

At the same time, the Coast Guard's law enforcement responsibilities have grown markedly due to the Cuban situation, the Russian trawler traffic in the North Atlantic and along the eastern seaboard, and heavy concentration of Japanese and Russian fishing vessels off Alaska.

Many Americans do not realize that the Coast Guard has the added chore of picking up Cuban refugees coming into Florida in small craft of every size and description. Since 1961, over 6,300 Cuban refugees have drifted into U.S. waters fleeing Communist Cuba. Nor is it their general realization that it is the U.S. Coast Guard that has the duty of preventing anti-Castro raiders from leaving from U.S. ports.

When a Russian or Cuban fishing vessel is spotted just outside the U.S. 3-mile limit, the Coast Guard must keep this vessel under constant surveillance.

Cuba has developed a modern fishing fleet during the last year. The four vessels seized recently by the Coast Guard for fishing in U.S. territorial waters are exceptionally well built and equipped with the latest conventional equipment; we can assume that the Soviet Union and Cuba intend to intensify their fishing operations in this hemisphere.

Our dependence upon the U.S. Coast Guard will be even greater as a result of the probing by these two countries.

To attend to the greatly increased search and rescue and law enforcement demands, as well as to carry out their

other varied normal functions, will require many more vessels, aircraft, and manpower than is found in this year's budget.

Evidence is mounting that there must be a rapid buildup in the U.S. Coast Guard facilities and personnel.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

I regret that due to a commitment of importance during the noon hour I was not present to hear all the debate. But I certainly join with the other Members in expressing the hope that the Coast Guard will be adequately financed. We in North Carolina, particularly the members of the North Carolina delegation, are very proud of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and our other member of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]. I am sure that when we vote on this legislation all of us will join in making the Coast Guard an even better organization.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9640 and to compliment the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], for their leadership in bringing this constructive and realistic bill to the floor, and I commend all the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for their part in reporting this bill.

With its 25,000 miles of coastline in the North Pacific, the people of my State of Alaska depend heavily upon the services of the Coast Guard, and, hold the Coast Guard in high esteem as the guardian of our shores, and the great performer of search and rescue missions. For years this fine organization has been underequipped and undermanned in Alaska, and sorely needs the housing units and improved base facilities and support facilities which would be authorized by this bill.

Others who have preceded me in support of this legislation have mentioned the increasing number of responsibilities which the Coast Guard has had to shoulder in recent years. High on the list of responsibilities is the protection of the territorial waters of the United States against the increasing number of encroachments by foreign fishing vessels. Furthermore, the day is soon coming when, in accordance with the convention on the Continental Shelf, the United States will be asserting ownership and jurisdiction of products upon or attached to the Continental Shelf along our coasts. This, in turn, indicates another great increase in patrol responsibility

which the Coast Guard should be adequately implemented to discharge.

In closing, I heartily advocate this proposed augmentation of financial support for the Coast Guard to enable it to modernize its facilities, and increase its capital plant, and expand its organization.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I wish to commend the chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] for the splendid work they did in committee and on the floor in securing approval of this bill and in explaining its great importance, and the necessity for authorization of the funds requested, so that the Coast Guard can perform its vital missions and satisfactorily discharge the responsibilities placed upon it.

As a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have had the privilege of studying this bill. I attended the committee meetings and heard the witnesses who came before us; I know that our Coast Guard must have all the help provided by this bill; that the generally inadequate facilities, both ashore and afloat, with which our Coast Guard is now contending, mean neglect on our part and that the situation must be corrected without delay. I am happy to give this bill my hearty support and to vote in favor of it.

Greatly increased responsibilities have been placed upon our Coast Guard in recent years. Expansion of activities due to enactment of the Federal Boating Act of 1958, the growth of the Russian fishing fleet in Atlantic waters, the incursion of the Japanese fishing fleet off the State of Alaska, the Cuban crisis, to mention a few facts, all demand that the Coast Guard which has been severely handicapped by progressive obsolescence of its equipment and inadequate funds with which to replace units when necessary, now be given assistance to the fullest extent so that it can carry out the expanded functions and increased responsibilities required of it. I urge all Members to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation most wholeheartedly. I live in a coastal area which is constantly patrolled by the Coast Guard. Personally, I have been rescued twice by the Coast Guard. I am familiar with their equipment and I know that it is obsolete. It is time that we did something for the Coast Guard. This is the first step in that direction through this legislation.

The U.S. Coast Guard performs services all over the world and in every State of our Nation with the exception of the State of Wyoming.

I am sure that if a need developed in that great State, the Coast Guard would

meet it regardless of how much it stretched their capability.

The Coast Guard has operated too long with inefficient and obsolete equipment, and it is time that steps be taken to remedy their deplorable situation. The fact that the Coast Guard is as efficient as it is is directly attributable to the high caliber and dedication of the officers and men who compose this service.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as a first step in doing something which should have been done a long time ago.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9640

A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the use of the Coast Guard, as follows:

Vessels

For procurement of—

- (1) one high endurance cutter;
- (2) six medium-endurance cutters;
- (3) one coastal tender;
- (4) three inland tenders;
- (5) three small harbor tugs;
- (6) nine small patrol cutters; and
- (7) one river tender.

Aircraft

For procurement of seventeen helicopters.

Construction

For establishment or development of Coast Guard installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Atlantic coast: Offshore light platforms at Diamond Shoals and Chesapeake Bay entrance.

Missouri River: Moorings for river tender. Air station, Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Replace runway.

Air detachment, Annette Island, Alaska: Family housing units and support facilities.

Detroit, Michigan: Operational facilities for helicopter detachment.

Aircraft repair and supply base, Elizabeth City, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities.

Air detachment, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Maintenance and operational facilities.

Moorings, Mayport, Florida: Administrative, operational, and maintenance facilities.

San Juan, Puerto Rico: Family housing units and support facilities.

Depot, Guam: Replace operational, administrative, and supply facilities.

Wilmington, North Carolina: Moorings for large cutter.

Base, Ketchikan, Alaska: Improve maintenance facilities.

Base, Woods Hole, Massachusetts: Improve operational and maintenance facilities.

Academy, New London, Connecticut: Field house.

Loran Station, Sitkinak, Alaska: Replace runway.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at

any point and that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 8, strike out "one high-endurance cutter" and insert "(1) two high-endurance cutters."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "six" and insert "eight".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was much impressed with the argument in behalf of this bill which was made by my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON]. The gentleman from North Carolina is one of the most economically minded Members of the House of Representatives.

This bill, as we all know, is \$21.5 million above the budget, but we can take care of that quite easily next week.

Mr. Chairman, we will have on the floor of the House next week a bill which was previously scheduled to come up this afternoon, the bill dealing with the International Development Association. It provides for an increase in the capital structure of the International Development Association's lending fund, as I understand it, of some \$312 million. This could very well be cut out altogether, but with the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], as well as the Members who are now on the floor—with your help come next week we could provide the extra money requested in this bill and still keep the President well within the overall budget he has outlined by cutting the \$312 million, not only by \$21.5 million, but why not cut it in two or cut it out altogether?

We would then have a cushion to work on for some other requirements here in the United States.

I ask the Members here this afternoon to join with some of us next week in cutting down that bill. Remember, this is just another foreign aid agency piled on top of the parent agency, known as the Agency for International Development. The International Development Association is a 40-year lending operation. For the first 10 years there is no payment whatever of interest or on the principal. In the second 10 years there is a small payment on the principal, and a slightly larger payment in the last 20 years. Throughout the 40 years not a dime of interest is paid. Of course, you and I know the foreign borrowers are never going to pay off these so-called loans. This is just another adjunct to

the foreign giveaway program. Join with me next week, if you will, and we can take care of today's spending on the Coast Guard and still present the President with more than a balanced budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON) Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to assure the gentleman I will assist him in his efforts to reduce whatever that figure may be by this amount, or more, and when any mutual assistance program comes up I will assist him in his efforts to cut those programs as well.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I wish other Members would arise and hit the sawdust trail either this afternoon or next week.

On television last night I saw pictures of the British mission which is going over to Russia to build chemical, fertilizer, and other plants. The thought occurred to me in connection with this bill and the necessity to take care of some of our own domestic enterprises, such as the Coast Guard, that the British could be helpful to us. If they have the money to lend the Russians or give them credits—call it what you will—to finance the building of fertilizer plants, chemical plants and rubber plants in Russia; why do the British not pay us all or part of the \$13 billion they owe us? Anything wrong with the British paying back at least part of the \$13 billion we loaned them? We would then have some money to take care of icebreakers for the Coast Guard, endurance cutters, and so forth.

I see no reason why the British, if they have the money to finance the Russians, cannot pay their obligations to the taxpayers of the United States. I suggest that President Johnson get busy and tell Prime Minister Home and Britain's international bankers that we have stood in line waiting for our money long enough.

It is about time a President of the United States made the British aware of some of the facts of life, and it is also time that victimizing American taxpayers to underwrite bogus "loans" to foreign governments be stopped.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this extra time to finish some remarks I was not allowed to finish before because of limitation of time. It is important for the Congress to know a little more about the Russian trawler situation because it does affect our security and the safety of our Nation. The Coast Guard does have the responsibility here.

As I said earlier, the Committee on Armed Services conducted an investigation of the Russian trawler situation and they found in two instances that the equipment of the Coast Guard off the coast of Florida for the surveillance of Russian vessels, when they came within the territorial waters of the United

States, was such that twice the Coast Guard vessels did not have enough speed to catch up with the Russian trawlers. In one instance there was a 7½-mile gap, and in another instance about a 3-mile gap.

We need to provide some equipment. The Secretary of the Treasury did not ask the Budget Bureau for any money to provide additional ships or airplanes for this patrol on Russian trawlers off Florida, as recommended by a subcommittee of the Congress of the United States.

He did not even make any request. There was no planning. So this committee took it up with the Coast Guard, and they say that in order effectively to have continuous patrols to the degree implied in the Florida Straits, off New England, and the Alaskan waters, the Coast Guard would require a rough estimate of at least three additional 95-foot patrol boats, five 210-foot minimum-endurance vessels, six minimum-range patrol planes, and three long-range patrol planes. Crew and support requirements would amount to about 475 officers and men. The activation and construction programs cost of the needed facilities is estimated at about \$29,500,000, and an annual operating cost of about \$7,420,000. It must be emphasized that this coverage would provide patrols only in the areas listed above.

I would think that the Secretary of the Treasury could go to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy and ask them to transfer to the Coast Guard sufficient vessels and manpower to tide us over until this committee can go through the authorizing legislation and we can go to the Appropriations Committee to get the ships and men necessary for the Coast Guard to do the work, because this is an important problem. It is going to be with us. The fishing is going to start soon off New England. We are going to see these vessels coming up and down our coasts, intelligence vessels mixed in with the fishing vessels, and we need a secure patrol.

I have talked to the chairman of this committee, who is greatly interested in this problem, and he has suggested that perhaps our committee can have hearings for a supplemental authorization to take care of this problem. I would commend him for his consideration of this problem, and would like to ask him if he could comment on the possibility of our perhaps going into this, since there is an immediate and urgent need, as stated by the Coast Guard, and they are now giving us information as to the necessary equipment and men it would take.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman realizes the fact that the Navy Department has the Navy and the Treasury Department has the Coast Guard. There are functions that the Navy on account of international relations cannot perform that the Coast Guard can perform.

With respect to coming in with an additional authorization bill, I want to be perfectly frank about that with the Members of the House and all who may read the RECORD. The Coast Guard does need

what is provided for here in addition to this other that the gentleman refers to. This is the first authorization bill on this matter. Certainly I would hate to commit myself, but we will hold hearings again shortly with the Coast Guard as to their further needs and be prepared next year, and we will see if as time goes on there is anything that can be done to strengthen them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Florida was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I perhaps feel a little more urgency for the solution of this problem, although I am sure the gentleman is concerned, too.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman understands that the personnel of the Coast Guard is limited, of course.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, I do.

Mr. BONNER. They just do not have the personnel to do all of the things. When you take a cutter, let us say, out of the Chesapeake or the Delaware or the New York area to send it down to Florida, you are then depleting the service in the Chesapeake or the Delaware or the New York area which the people in those areas expect to have. In other words, they do not have any surplus stuff to use in emergency cases.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. That is true, of course. What I was asking was if the chairman could, perhaps, hold additional hearings this year to consider this problem as to whether we should give additional authorization because we do not have any surplus ships at all. In fact, when a ship has to go into drydock, they do not even have a ship to replace the one that they have to put in drydock. I will present for the consideration of the Congress, if it is deemed advisable, perhaps, on the appropriation bill, sufficient moneys to provide what is necessary for the Coast Guard to have in order to patrol our seas and protect these shores. I think in the meantime the Navy can, in conjunction with the Coast Guard, provide enough facilities and men to do the necessary patrolling off the shores of Florida and New England until we can provide the Coast Guard the necessary ships and the necessary personnel which they do not have now but which they desperately need in order to provide for the security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

The Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9640) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, pursuant to the resolution, House Resolution 623, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4638—PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1964.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my withdrawal as House conferee on H.R. 4638.
CHET HOLIFIELD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4638—PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] to fill the vacancy on the committee of conference on the bill, H.R. 4638.

The Clerk will notify the Senate accordingly.

AUTHORIZING PICTURES TO BE TAKEN OF THE HOUSE IN SESSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that tomorrow it is expected House Resolution 552, authorizing a picture of the House in session, might be called up.

ELIGIBILITY OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE CONGRESS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court on Tuesday, February 17, in the case of *Wesberry v. Sanders*, No. 22, October term 1963, clearly demonstrated that the sky is the limit so far as this Supreme Court's efforts to take over all branches of the Government.

When the Supreme Court in that decision said, by a majority of 6 to 3, that the Court had a right to determine who is eligible to be seated in the House of Representatives, it left no question but what that court, in its mad grab for power, means to take over the whole country and that the Constitution means absolutely nothing to it.

Mr. Speaker, that decision was rendered in the face of section 5 of article I of the Constitution, as follows:

Each House is the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

The Court would add its own restrictions to the limitations of the Constitution having to do with eligibility of Representatives in the Congress. The constitutional limitations are as follows:

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years and who shall not when elected be a resident of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately this House of Representatives does not have to pay any attention to the Supreme Court in this instance. After all, the Supreme Court is one of three branches of the Government and although the House of Representatives, in recent years, has stood by while the Supreme Court has assumed the power to legislate and, actually, to amend the Constitution, certainly unless the House speaks up in this instance it will have made itself a party to a judicial dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I have, therefore, today introduced the following resolution:

H. RES. 629

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States the House of Representatives is the sole judge of qualifications of its own members, and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Wesberry* against *Sanders*, No. 22, October term, 1963, in the decision rendered on the 17th day of February 1964, has attempted to usurp this power granted by the Constitution of the United States specifically to the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does here and now declare its intention to seat as Representatives in Congress otherwise qualified Members-elect whom the House of Representatives may determine to have been duly elected in accordance with the laws of their respective States.

This resolution, under the rules, should go to the House Administration Committee, headed by a strong believer in the Constitution, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, of Texas.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following resolution which would amend the rules of the House, as follows:

H. RES. 628

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be and they are hereby amended by inserting after rule VIII a new rule, as follows:

Rule VIIIa. In the exercise of its power specifically granted by section 5 of article I of the Constitution to be "the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members" the House shall seat as Representatives those persons, otherwise qualified, determined by the House to be duly elected in accordance with the laws of their respective States notwithstanding the determina-

tion of any court as to the validity of any such law.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules this would go to the Committee on Rules, headed by the distinguished constitutional lawyer, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH. I trust and hope that our friends on these committees will take immediate action, that the Court may know that the House of Representatives recognizes in this recent power grab by the Supreme Court that it is not merely the Congress or Representatives in the Congress who are affected, but in this decision this Court is attempting to take unto itself the right to deprive the people of their power as expressed through the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that the constitutional requirement is only that a Member be a resident of the State from which he is elected. It is to be remembered that several Members of the present Congress do not even live in their district; and I am advised the late Congressman Sabbath, of Illinois, served some 40-odd years and never lived in his district and, of course, there have been many more.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the House of Representatives and the Congress restore its standing as a coequal branch of Government, on a par with the judicial and the executive departments. The day is late. We need to take immediate action.

Then Mr. Speaker, if the Congress wishes to provide for equal or contiguous districts, it can be done in a constitutional manner by the Congress.

The laws included such a provision until 1929; but the Congress, after many years of experience with it, concluded at that time to delete it. If this action should be reviewed, it is for the Congress rather than the courts to do so.

THEY CREATED THEIR OWN TROUBLE

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture have only themselves to blame for the troubles they are having in regard to the shipment of wheat to Russia. Despite assurances that American-flag vessels would be permitted to carry a fair share of the wheat cargoes, these Departments have deliberately sought to exclude participation by American ships. Testimony before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee clearly reveals this.

One of the devices used to exclude American ships was the assertion that the sale of wheat was a commercial transaction. The purpose of the assertion was to avoid the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act which provides that at least 50 percent of Government-sponsored cargoes must be carried in

U.S.-flag vessels. All Public Law 480 cargoes are handled under this act.

The assertion that wheat sales to Russia are commercial is, in my opinion, unfounded. There was and is more Government sponsorship in these sales than in any sales of grain under Public Law 480. In the first place, no sale of wheat to Russia could have been made but for the decision of the President. Thereafter, no private participation in the matter took place until after the three Departments had held extensive meetings to determine all facets of the wheat sales, including, if you please, the establishment of a ceiling on the ocean freight rates to be paid. This ceiling, as admitted by Government witnesses, was fixed so low as to exclude participation by most U.S. ships. As further indication that this is not an ordinary commercial transaction, the Government, not the exporter, is now negotiating with the longshoremen who say they will not load the wheat scheduled for Russia.

All the difficulties now encountered by the three Departments could have been eliminated if they had designated the wheat sale transactions to be Government-sponsored—which they in fact were. Then the Cargo Preference Act would have been applied, and the cargoes would have been handled as they are under Public Law 480. A higher rate is paid to U.S. vessels than to foreign vessels. This is what Congress directed by the Cargo Preference Act.

Interestingly enough, under the current arrangement in addition to the normal export subsidy of 58 cents per bushel, the Department of Agriculture will pay an additional 14½ cents per bushel for ocean freight. It is, of course, paid "in kind." That is, the Department pays the exporter in grain which he can sell to get cash to pay the ocean freight. Thus, the Government in effect is subsidizing the foreign-flag carrier under the present arrangement. Under the Cargo Preference Act the American-flag carrier could participate to the extent of about 50 percent of such subsidy.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the House is going to be denied the right to work its will again. Ever since the wheat referendum was turned down by the farmers just about a year ago, many of us have been urging that wheat legislation be passed. Now it appears the other body will be adding wheat legislation to the cotton bill which we sent over there and send it back to us.

By this process the Committee on Agriculture will not report out a wheat bill. Neither will the House have an opportunity to work its will on a wheat bill. All the House will have an opportunity to do is to accept or reject the conference report. It should be pointed out that the certificate wheat program which was en-

acted into law in 1962 and which the farmers subsequently rejected in 1963 was never actually passed by the House. The omnibus farm bill in which it was included was defeated in the House. Later, the House passed a feed grains and wheat bill which did not include a certificate plan and this was added in the Senate and accepted in conference.

The same situation arose in the higher education academic facilities bill which the House passed with overwhelming support in 1962. The Senate passed a similar bill but added a section providing for scholarships, a provision which the House was not willing to accept. As a consequence, the House defeated the conference report on this legislation, and we were again denied the opportunity to consider legislation in this important area. It would be just as detrimental to consider wheat legislation in this way.

I am opposed to the certificate wheat plan. Many of my Democratic colleagues favor it and they may be successful in securing majority support for it in the House. However, every Member should have an opportunity to work for the development of the type of legislation he feels is in the national interest. We will be denied this opportunity if the present plan prevails.

Let me point out one important change in wheat legislation which should be enacted; that is, when the loan level is as low as it will be in 1964 without legislation or with the proposed certificate wheat program, the CCC resale formula should be increased from 105 percent of the support level to 115 percent of the support level plus carrying charges. Since this is not included in the Senate bill, there is no way it could be added in conference since it would not be germane. In order that my colleagues might have a clear indication of the importance of this change in farm law, together with a listing of the pros and cons on this issue which will clearly indicate the necessity of the change, I would like you to look over the statement prepared by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives which follows:

THE PROS AND CONS OF A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN SUPPORT AND RESALE PRICES OF WHEAT IN 1964 LEGISLATION—105 PERCENT VERSUS 115 PERCENT RESALE PRICE

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, provided that in selling commodities for unrestricted use, the CCC price should be not less than 105 percent of the support price plus "reasonable carrying charges" (interest, storage).

2. In 1958, Congress provided, in the case of cotton, that the CCC sales price formula should be changed from 105 to 115 percent. There are a large number of proposals to make a similar change applicable to wheat in 1964 legislation.

3. The largest influence on the open market price of wheat at or immediately after harvest is the level of support prices available in the form of loans or purchase agreements to farmers. In subsequent months, the market price is influenced increasingly by the CCC selling price formula, usually called the "resale price." This price is published monthly by CCC covering sales from its inventories for unrestricted use.

4. The loan price at harvest-time provides the major alternative to sale for cash at the

current market price by producers. Thus, the loan serves the function of a floor price for wheat. So also, the CCC resale price becomes the "ceiling" price because buyers of wheat will not pay more than the price at which at a given time they can buy it from CCC.

5. The range between the floor and the ceiling prices, as described above, has been narrowed by reduction in the CCC markup to reflect carrying charges in recent years.

Earlier, CCC sold at 105 percent of the support price during July, the first month of the wheat marketing year, then added 2 cents per month to its price to cover interest and storage costs to CCC for a total of 9 months ending April 30. It added no carrying charges for May and June—then reset its price at 105 percent of the applicable support July 1.

The carrying charge of 2 cents per month was halved. (There were, as always, variations reflecting grade, class, location, billing, etc. Loading-out charges averaging three-fourths of a cent were added to offset any such cost if incurred by CCC in connection with the sale and, as in the case of "in" charges, can, for purposes of this discussion, be disregarded in examining the changes in the formula price.)

Thus, CCC's resale price was reduced well below the cost experience of grain firms and well below customary trade practice.

6. CCC operations are required, under the charter enacted by Congress in 1948-49, to employ the usual and customary channels of trade and commerce. Unless restraint is exercised, in view of its great and growing power, its vast money resources, its non-need to subject its operations to profit-and-loss criteria, CCC can dominate wheat prices, wheat supplies, sales, movements—in short, all wheat commerce of a significant character. To do so is neither contemplated, required, nor encouraged by Congress under the laws so far enacted, but it is probably necessary for Congress to restate its position from time to time.

II. ADVANTAGES OF THE 115-PERCENT PROVISIO

1. Recently in arguing the advantages of certain measures intended to reduce CCC inventory, USDA estimated the cost of carrying a bushel of wheat as averaging 26.21 cents per year. This was made up of 13.53 cents for storage and handling; an average of 3.93 cents for transportation; an average cost incident to resale of 1.24 cents per bushel; and interest computed at its estimated cost to CCC of 7.51 cents per bushel.

Such estimates compared with the value judgments expressed in the advance in price to reflect carrying charges at a maximum of 9 cents per bushel over a 12-month period indicates a major contradiction. Furthermore, it indicates that CCC has traveled far indeed from the patterns employed in the usual and customary channels of trade in figuring carrying charges.

This contradiction also illustrates that mandates from Congress can turn and twist in unfathomable ways within a few years; that the current practice with respect to carrying charges are unrealistic, illogical, and in violation of CCC charter provisions.

This situation requires correction without regard to determination of the merits of 105 percent versus 115 percent.

2. If Congress desires to encourage the grain marketing industry to exercise initiative and enterprise, it must reexamine the condition and durability of the rules Congress established to prevent unfair competition by CCC.

3. The 105 versus 115 percent issue, for purposes of objective examination of advantages and disadvantages, should be analyzed without regard to the specific level of support. In the case of various proposals for legislation for wheat presently under consideration, there is a considerable variation in the proposed levels of support.

The issue should be examined, first of all, in terms of its effects on stimulating private trade efforts in the marketplace.

4. If the considered views of the grain marketing industry were requested, it may be remarked parenthetically that in excess of 95 to 99 percent of the leaders would be found to view CCC's present role as needlessly large and as in a state of aggressive growth.

An example: CCC requested the grain marketing industry to expand grain storage space for a number of years. Rates were gradually increased on a number of occasions. Warehousemen were offered other incentives to expand facilities. The result has been an increase in commercial grain storage facilities from about 1.25 billion bushels in 1950 to 5,453,240,000 bushels as of January 1, 1964. The latter figure is at least twice to three times the normal needs.

In addition, CCC owns bins and other storage facilities with a capacity presently rated at 965 million bushels and has no program for reducing or disposing of these facilities which were originally brought into being with assurances to the grain marketing industry that they were for "standby and emergency use."

It is axiomatic that one Secretary of Agriculture, even within the same administration, is not bound by the pleadings or promises of his predecessors. Thus, the present Secretary, unless continuity of policy in fairness to the marketing industry is insisted upon by Congress, may proceed as he desires in a number of areas with results which can be most serious to the grain marketing industry.

To illustrate:

(a) He may favor the use of CCC-owned storage over commercial space, despite the language of the CCC charter. The CCC-owned storage facilities pay no taxes to school districts, townships, counties, States, or the Federal Government; they are not essential to provide storage service at present except in a very few localities; they are expensive to maintain and administer because they do not justify the cost of modern equipment for large, efficient bulk handling of grain.

(b) He may, as he has only recently intimated, place grain storage rates on a competitive bid or other basis which would destroy the public utility principle of equal treatment for all farmers and other depositors. The bid system could result in curtailing operation of the higher-cost structures in areas with the highest operating costs. It would provide a very great advantage to the lowest-cost but least serviceable storages from the long-range standpoint of providing farmers an efficient marketing system—such as sheepshed-type storage and similar facilities, including remodeled military barracks, abandoned railroad roundhouses, etc.

(c) Unless restrained, he could exercise unchallenged authority to cut existing carrying charges even further than they have been cut. He might, for example, reduce to zero the incentive of grain firms to build inventory for resale or for millers to acquire stocks from CCC at prices largely dictated by CCC's resale policies and practices.

5. The 115-percent resale minimum would reduce program costs because it would have the effect of increasing the volume of purchases to meet their requirements by millers and other end-users during harvest and through the redemption of loans by farmers. This would reduce the takeover volume of CCC.

Each bushel of grain which passes into the hands of CCC involves a considerable cost and a substantial loss, especially during the period of declining prices which are now in prospect.

For example, the reduction in the value of CCC inventory, assuming it will be about 1 billion bushels as of July 1, in case the sup-

port price is reduced from that in effect last year to \$1.30 or so, national average, next July 1 is obviously a very substantial sum.

6. The following illustrates the basis for computing the CCC resale price under 105- and 115-percent provisions in case the national average wheat loan level should be \$1.30 as of the marketing year beginning next July 1:

(a) The resale price for CCC stocks of wheat acquired under past programs for July of this year would be \$1.30 times 105 percent, or \$1.365. On August 1, 1 cent would be added and 1 cent per month thereafter for 8 additional months. The resale price would reach its maximum of \$1.455 in April 1965, remaining at that level until adjusted for the new marketing year starting July 1, 1965, in accord with the law then in effect.

(b) Should the 115-percent provision be in effect, the resale price for July 1964 would be \$1.30 times 115 percent, or \$1.495. By April 1965, the addition of an unrealistic "loss-leader" carrying charge of only 1 cent per month would bring the resale price for April, May, and June of 1965 to \$1.585.

7. The 115-percent formula would help insure that the United States would not have to place an embargo on wheat exported to comply with the minimum price under the International Wheat Agreement, pursuant to the Nation's commitment under that agreement.

The July 1964 price, under a \$1.30 loan level and the 105-percent proviso, would place the United States in a position where it would be offering wheat into export channels below the minimum price as related to the schedule set up under IWA, unless some unusual action was taken by the U.S. Government to insure meeting the IWA commitment.

Authority to deal with this matter was delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture by the late President Kennedy soon after farmers voted to reject wheat marketing quotas in the referendum conducted in May 1963.

8. There are other reasons to support the 115-percent proviso, chiefly centering on lower costs to the CCC, encouraging the use of the marketing system, and reducing the prospect of cycling of CCC stocks. This is the process whereby CCC takes possession of stocks acquired under price support with one outstretched hand while, with its other long hand, it sells out inventory which it has possessed for 1, 2, or 3 years. Where CCC owns the commodity outright, this should be known as the stalling period.

For demand to be met out of current production by farmers assists in reducing CCC costs; it reduces the cycling of stocks; it contributes to more aggressive marketing activity on the part of the grain marketing industry to meet domestic and export needs.

III. THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE 115-PERCENT PROVISIO

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has, at present, authority to increase support and resale prices. The principal argument in opposition to writing into law a provision requiring a minimum resale price of 115 percent of the support price or the market price, whichever is higher, is that such authority resides in the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time and that he would exercise it if need be.

It is argued that public confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture on the part of farmers and the wheat marketing industry, on the part of Members of Congress of both parties, and on the part of the public generally, is extremely high; that he should be entrusted with the broadest possible delegation of authority by Congress in such matters as the CCC resale price.

Furthermore, Congress should, it is argued, leave to his judgment and discretion such matters so as to insure that "a nonpolitical, scientific, and enlightened policy and program would be pursued devoid of congressional controversy" which such program

specifics as the 115-percent proposal might engender; that it is assumed he would seek the guidance of the marketing industry, of farm organizations, and of farmers themselves to guide his decisionmaking.

2. The decisions he would make, because they would not be announced in advance, could well keep competitors of the United States in the world wheat trade guessing long and hard; that this tactic would be in the best tradition of Yankee trading and would immeasurably increase the bargaining power of the United States in international wheat markets because of his experience and proved skill in such matters.

3. By delegating the broadest possible powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, Congress will be arming him and his successors with the tools and authority to exercise his demonstrated skills in public management, in achieving efficiency and economy, in inventory management, in reducing operating costs of the Department of Agriculture, and related matters.

4. It may well be that the Secretary, after studying the matter, may decide that resale of wheat should be at 120 percent or a higher percentage of the support level. For Congress to have specified a minimum of 115 percent might, in such event, appear to be inhibiting the making of a decision to specify a higher resale price.

5. It is also argued that the utility of merchandising efforts, domestic and export, of the grain marketing industry have been greatly overvalued and overstated; that the farmers' interest would be better served by enlarging the role of Government in acquiring stocks and disposing of them; and that leaving the matter to the determination of the Secretary would facilitate this development.

MEAT IMPORT AGREEMENT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, it did not take long for the people of South Dakota to recognize the impact on our No. 1 industry, agriculture, of the meat import agreement reached Monday between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand.

Judging from the letters, telegrams, and telephone calls now pouring into my office, the livestock producers in South Dakota, who provide nearly 70 percent of the agricultural income within our farm State economy, are thunderstruck. We can only regard this agreement as a sellout, a surrender, and a catastrophe for our livestock industry.

It is inconceivable to me how our negotiators could sacrifice this important industry at a time when a massive tax cut is argued for as essential to stimulate business expansion, economic growth, and head off recession. It also comes at a time when official Agriculture Department predictions call for a 5-percent-or-more drop in farm income this year. It comes at a time when farmers have no wheat program to head off a sharp break in prices.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the concessions given to Australia and New Zealand by this agreement, in the face of such economic conditions confronting our farm-

ers and livestock producers, are nothing short of shocking.

The agreement is referred to by our State and Agriculture Departments as one to limit meat imports from these two countries in competition with our own livestock production. This agreement might be better described simply as a freeze on these imports at near their present excessive levels.

It was negotiated in clear disregard of the wishes expressed repeatedly by representatives of livestock producer organizations and by their elected Representatives in the Congress.

Pursuing the "can't win" philosophy that we have seen in some other foreign policy decisions, our negotiators acceded to Australia-New Zealand wishes to use the high-import years of 1962 and 1963 as the base period on which any rollback would be based. Even at that, they obtained only a 6-percent cutback in meat imports and magnanimously awarded a growth factor of 3.7 percent a year to this foreign competition.

Now the livestock producers of this Nation do not exist in a make-believe world where there is no competition for their products. They recognize the need for international trade and the fact that trade must be a two-way street. Yet, ever since the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, we have in effect erected a worldwide network of one-way signs pointing to the United States as a dumping ground for foreign products and meat imports in particular.

Our livestock producers had recommended repeatedly that the base period for seeking to obtain voluntary concessions from our friends and allies, Australia, and New Zealand, be the average level of imports in the years from 1957 through 1962. Every year in this 5-year period showed a large volume of imports. So it would not have been a low-base period. It could hardly be regarded as protectionist or isolationism.

Average beef imports for that period were 1,045,000 pounds, equal to about 6.7 percent of our own production. Instead our negotiators from the very beginning conducted these discussions from a position of weakness, using the high years of 1962 and 1963 when imports were twice as high in terms of domestic consumption.

The agreement was rushed to conclusion without regard to the Tariff Commission study requested by the Senate Finance Committee to determine the total impact of these competitive meat imports on prices received by domestic producers. When the results of that study are made known about June 1—and there is little doubt it will show a highly adverse impact—the hands of Congress will be virtually tied when it comes to providing any relief.

Thus, our State, and Agriculture Department negotiators have bargained away not only the rights of domestic livestock producers but also the rights of Congress by agreeing this Nation will make no increases in its duties on beef, veal, and mutton imported from Australia and New Zealand. Should Congress enact any legislation on this subject as recommended by a number of

Members, the President under the terms of this agreement would be dutybound to veto it.

In South Dakota the cattle industry is an important part of our agricultural economy. Our leading organization representing that industry is the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association headed by Merton Glover, of Porcupine, S. Dak.

I include at this point a telegram received from that organization which is typical of the protests now pouring into my office:

The Beef Import Agreement announced on Monday, February 17, 1964, with Australia and New Zealand, permitting imports surpassing anything this country has ever experienced would be disastrous to the cattle industry of South Dakota.

The cattle industry in South Dakota generates the greatest income, employment, investment, and source of urban main street commerce of any industry in South Dakota.

The import agreement reached with Australia and New Zealand for the years 1964, 1965, and 1966 will cripple the cattle industry and economy of South Dakota.

We have appeared before the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission discussing the impact of imports on South Dakota and have asked to be heard in April for the hearings authorized by the Senate Finance Committee.

We are certain the agreement announced will financially ruin a large number of the cattle operators in South Dakota and will further prevent any expansion of the cattle industry in South Dakota.

We ask this agreement be canceled by you until such time as hearings asked for by the Senate Finance Committee can be completed and the total beef import problem be examined.

The serious jeopardy the agreement with Australia and New Zealand places upon our people and cattle operators requires me to urge you to give this request your personal and immediate attention.

MERTON GLOVER,
President, South Dakota Stockgrowers
Association.
PORCUPINE, S. DAK.

The attention of Members is directed especially to this comment of Mr. Glover:

We are certain the agreement announced will financially ruin a large number of the cattle operators in South Dakota and will further prevent any expansion of the cattle industry in South Dakota.

The stockgrowers association asks that the agreement be canceled before it has even begun. Even this is impossible under the terms of the agreement, for the earliest date at which it can be canceled would be at year's end.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what can be done to correct this flagrant injustice wreaked upon the livestock producer by this week's agreement which seems to seal off every possible avenue of relief. Certainly the livestock producer has received not even sympathy for the decline in his prices over the past year. The best advice one Cabinet official could offer was to recommend cattlemen "cut out your whining."

The Agriculture Department seems to view the problem as one of producers holding their animals too long and marketing them at excessively heavy weights. This is true to some extent, but it is the only means by which the livestock producer can hope to recover his investment. He holds his animals off the market

extra long in the hope that market prices might recover. The far-from-accurate market predictions of the Agriculture Department are in part the cause of this overweight marketing.

I understand the Department has just revised its predictions once more and instead of the market improvement promised for this month, it is now expected to show an upturn in April or May. How many additional cattle feeders will be ruined in the interim, no one can predict.

I appeal to those in the Congress and in the administration who recognize the seriousness of this problem not to regard this agreement as the solution, for indeed it is no solution at all. It simply makes permanent the problem.

I plead on behalf of the livestock producers of this Nation and the millions who depend upon them for their livelihoods that continued study and reassessment be carried out in the hope that some avenue of relief can be found. If not found soon, this agreement should be terminated at the earliest practicable date.

SALUTE TO LITHUANIA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians and people of Lithuanian descent around the world are marking three important anniversaries this month. They are observing the 713th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. They mark the 711th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom, when Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first king of the Lithuanian empire. And they remembered the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

While these days should be happy occasions for the Lithuanians everywhere, they are haunted by the fact that since June 15, 1940, their freedom-loving country has been suffering under the hands of Soviet captors. It was then that the Soviet Union took over the little country of Lithuania by force of arms.

We, in the United States, can proudly say that we have never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the Free Republic of Lithuania. We maintain and support the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, D.C., and four Lithuanian consulates.

In these days, when the Communists seem to be pushing ahead on nearly every front, when they are insulting the image of freedom from Panama to Zanzibar, from Vietnam to Guantanamo, it would be well for us to take a good long look at just what this godless ideology has done in the past to such freedom-loving peoples as the Lithuanians. It

seems incredible that we could ever lose sight of these facts which I will relate but which are not, in fact, new.

Since June of 1940—in 23 years—more than one-fourth of the Lithuanian population has disappeared at the hands of the Communists. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been murdered by the Communists or have died in exile in Soviet slave labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places in Russia.

As the new emerging nations in Africa and other areas of the world make new demands for freedom and independence, we should not lose sight of the fact that there are, on this earth, countries such as Lithuania, now over 700 years old, which have the same right to freedom and independence as any new state. The denial of freedom anywhere in the world can lead to its denial everywhere.

In this connection, in November of last year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 234. The resolution would direct our representatives in the United Nations to bring before that world body the question of holding free elections in the so-called captive nations. It is now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hope that my colleagues in the House and on that committee will soon take action on this resolution. The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over the aforesaid countries by force of arms; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the liberation question of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the aforesaid countries;

(2) to return all exiles and prisoners from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in these countries under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against these nations.

U.S. FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on behalf of a bill which I have today introduced to protect U.S. fishing rights.

The necessity for this bill arises from the misconduct of other nations. For years our unofficial 3-mile territorial limit was observed by fishermen of other nations with a fair degree of responsibility. However, during the past few years, violations of our territorial waters have occurred with annoying frequency.

We have no law at present that has teeth. This bill simply provides that any foreign craft violating our territorial waters would be subject to penalties, which include seizure of catch, tackle, and cargo, imprisonment of personnel for up to a year and a fine of \$10,000. Present law establishes the illegality of violating territorial waters, but provides no penalties.

The bill does not define territorial waters. It does not change any of our present fishing laws, territorial designations, or foreign policy. It will put the United States in line with other nations which zealously protect their territorial waters. The Soviet Union, one of the chief violators of our territorial waters has, during the past decade, seized 854 Japanese fishing vessels and 7,042 Japanese fishermen. In addition, the Soviets have sealed off vast areas of productive water which increases the pressure of Japanese fishermen on our territorial waters. In recent months there have been incidents which could have led to serious international ramifications as our fishermen do not intend to have their gear demolished by international poachers without reprisal of one means or another.

Today when an international interloper is spotted within our territorial waters, we can only ask that he leave. This bill would make a future raid on U.S. coastal fisheries an unappealing act, fraught with risk of serious penalty.

By setting up a definite law—one which is unmistakable in its intent and coverage—and by notifying all the governments of the world that we intend to enforce this law to the fullest, we can provide the protection our fishing industry needs.

It would, of course, be necessary to devise effective means of implementing this law. Use of aerial and surface enforcement would, I am sure, provide adequate coverage to discourage abuses of our fishing areas. Given authority, I am certain that the Coast Guard, Navy, and other agencies can come up with a method of patrol and interception that will be able to cope with "hit and run" type of poaching raids.

This bill applies to waters from Maine to the gulf, from California to Alaska. Our fishermen everywhere need this

measure of protection. It provides for protection of certain resources on the Continental Shelf. Much remains to be done in the field of concisely defining these resources and the extent of the area covered. However, it takes a valuable first step in that direction, and I believe this provision is a valid and important part of the bill. The bill passed the Senate on October 1, 1963, without controversy.

I support in general the provisions of S. 1988 as it passed the Senate. There are two modifications which I would like to suggest to the committee for consideration. In section 2, line 12, I would recommend striking out the words "and to land its catch in a United States port." This language, I believe, poses a threat to all of our major fishing industries, be it salmon or as in my home area, tuna. It is intended to permit research vessels to conduct research within the territorial waters of the United States. The idea of having the vessel sell its catch at U.S. ports opens an avenue of abuse that could defeat the very purpose of this bill. The United Nations plans vast research projects, with participating boats fishing in territorial waters of other nations and selling their catch to defray expenses. The joker in this deck is that we cannot trust some of the participating nations. We know the Russian fishing trawlers are not all trawlers, but advanced espionage outposts. What would prevent a similar situation from developing, where commercial fishing boats would be designated as "research" vessels and actively engage in commercial fishing under the protection of this act? Although the language says the Secretary of the Treasury must get permission from the State, Commonwealth or Territory, it has been the painful experience of lesser levels of government that the Federal Government does not always recognize these provisions or challenges their jurisdiction. To make this act effective, I feel we should strike this language.

In order that there be no conflict by interpretation, I would suggest that the following language be written into the bill as section 5:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend or repeal the provisions of section 4311 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, 46 U.S.C. 251.

This section of the code defines in specific language fishing rights of American vessels, and in addition this language:

Except as otherwise provided by treaty or convention to which the United States is a party, no foreign-flag vessel shall, whether documented as a cargo vessel or otherwise, land in a port of the United States its catch of fish taken on board such vessels on the high seas, or fish products processed therefrom, or any fish or fish products taken on board such a vessel on the high seas from a vessel engaged in fishing operations or on the processing of fish or fish products.

I feel it is important that this section of the code be fully effective and that we make it clear that the measure under consideration in no way suggests changes, revisions, or lessens the effectiveness of this section.

With these two revisions, this bill will provide the apparatus to enforce an existing law. As such it is needed.

PENNSYLVANIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania's Governor Scranton has recently set forth his recommendations for proposed changes in Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Fund provisions in order to retrieve this fund from fiscal collapse. Presently, the State of Pennsylvania owes the Federal Government more than \$165 million which was borrowed from the Federal Government to keep up payments in previous years to the unemployed in our State. I strongly support the Governor's forthright and courageous position with respect to this legislation.

In an effort to put this fund back into proper balance and to increase the weekly benefits to the legitimately unemployed, the recommendations list the elimination of loopholes presently inherent in the State eligibility requirements. Some of the heads of the labor unions in Pennsylvania have sought to make a political issue out of Governor Scranton's recommendations and have put forth statements which the Governor has called "political and misleading." Governor Scranton's most recent comments on this subject are listed in the statement which follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, HARRISBURG, PA., FEBRUARY 17, 1964

Comments by Gov. William W. Scranton after publication of a memorandum from the U.S. Labor Department to the Democratic National Committee concerning Scranton administration proposals to reform the unemployment compensation laws:

"Like most people I am shocked that opponents of unemployment compensation reform are channeling opposition through the Democratic National Committee.

"This substantiates our charge that much of the opposition has been 'blatantly political.' It throws a cloud of suspicion over the motives of reform opponents, since it clearly indicates that they consider this a political issue, not an issue of Pennsylvania's economic survival and prosperity.

"Let me make one point emphatically clear: There is no political prize big enough to make me turn my back on the unemployed of this State. It is for their sake that we must have reform.

"I am not going to stand by silently while Pennsylvania's unemployment compensation mess continues to fester until it erupts and causes irreparable hardship to the people of this State.

"Meanwhile, the political memorandum from the U.S. Labor Department to the Democratic National Committee emphasizes the weak position of the reform opponents.

"Secretary of Labor Wirtz is clearly on the record favoring elimination of the second round of benefits. The memorandum to the Democratic Committee hints that this posi-

tion was contingent upon enactment of a total Federal unemployment compensation program.

"That is not what he said in his letter of July 16, 1963, to the chairman of the Federal House Committee on Government Operations. Without any conditions he said in that letter that:

"This Department in order to insure that only individuals who have had a very recent attachment to the labor force are eligible for benefits, has encouraged the States to modify their laws to provide that the lag period be reduced to less than 3 months. Such modification of the State lag period would assure that no individual (whether State-covered or Federal employee or ex-serviceman) would be able to establish eligibility in a second consecutive benefit year based on wages from the last separating employer paid prior to the first benefit year."

"Stripped of bureaucratic gobbledygook, what the Secretary was saying—without any ifs, ands or buts—was that the U.S. Department of Labor has been encouraging the States to eliminate the second round of benefits. The Department's political memorandum admits that the reform of second round payments which we have proposed is similar to what they've been encouraging all States to do.

"But, to give the Democratic National Committee a political point to argue, the Department now says that it favors elimination of the second round only if a new Federal program is totally adopted. That is not what Mr. Wirtz said in his letter of July 16.

"And for good reason. The Federal program has to do with the first 52 weeks of unemployment. It does not have to do with the 30-week period for which Pennsylvania now pays the second round and which follows the first 52 weeks.

"Nor does the Labor Department's political memorandum mention that not one other major Eastern industrial State—and they are the States with which we are in competition for new plants and new jobs—pays a second round. Why hasn't the U.S. Labor Department advocated that all of these States which compete with Pennsylvania start paying a second round until a new Federal program is passed?

"Most important of all, the political memorandum proposes no solutions to the serious unemployment compensation problems faced by Pennsylvania. It does not suggest how we are to get our fund out of bankruptcy, how we are to pay higher weekly benefits to the legitimately unemployed, or how we are to make it possible for Pennsylvania to compete successfully for more plants and more jobs. It doesn't offer a solution, because the only solution possible is the reform program advocated by this administration.

"The U.S. Labor Department is obviously unable to frankly say so in a political memorandum to the Democratic National Committee. Instead, it blithely suggests continuing the loopholes, forgetting about the real problems, and assigning Pennsylvania to a future of high unemployment without a fund capable of paying legitimate benefits."

CHAPLAINCY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a student inquiry I recently received regarding the Chaplaincy of the House

of Representatives, I was surprised to find that little has been printed on the history of this position. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, together with a bibliography of references on Chaplains of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. I am sure my colleagues in the House will find this information most helpful in replying to similar inquiries from teachers and students.

MISCELLANEOUS HISTORICAL DATA ON CHAPLAINS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

I. AUTHORITY TO ELECT A CHAPLAIN

The House of Representatives derives from the Constitution its authority to elect a Chaplain. The Constitution provides that the House shall choose their Speaker and other officers. The other officers have from time to time been created and their duties defined by the rules of the House, which also are made pursuant to the authority of the Constitution, hence one of the rules prescribes the duties of the Chaplain.¹

II. OPENING OF SESSIONS OF CONGRESS WITH PRAYER

The custom of opening the daily sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives with prayer is a very old one dating back to the Continental Congress. The Journal of the Continental Congress of September 6, 1774, first records the practice, which seems to have been continued in the Congress under our constitutional form of government. For many years it was customary to elect two chaplains, one by the Senate and one by the House of Representatives, who officiated alternately; but since 1856 each House has elected its own Chaplain.

In the first Congress, when the custom came over from the Continental Congress, George Washington was President of the United States.

During a protracted struggle over the organization of the House in the 35th Congress, and before a Chaplain was elected, the House was opened alternately with prayer daily by ministers of the gospel of Washington.

The original reason for the custom, although not of record, may be readily assumed to be as expressed in a resolution adopted by the House in later years, that "it eminently becomes Representatives of a people so highly favored to acknowledge in a public manner their reverence for God."—The Honorable William Tyler Page.

III. EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE REPORT NO. 124, 33D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Let us look at the history of chaplains in Congress. Here, as before, we shall find that the same practice was in existence before and after the adoption of the Constitution. The American Congress began its session September 5, 1774. On the second day of the session, Mr. Samuel Adams proposed to open the session with prayer. I give Mr. Webster's account of it: "At the meeting of the First Congress there was a doubt in the minds of many about the propriety of opening the session with prayer; and the reason assigned was, as here, the great diversity of opinion and religious belief: until, at last, Mr. Samuel Adams, with his gray hairs hanging about his shoulders, and with an impressive venerableness now seldom to be met with (I suppose owing to different habits), rose in that assembly, and, with the air of a perfect Puritan, said it did not become men

professing to be Christian men, who had come together for solemn deliberation in the hour of their extremity, to say there was so wide a difference in their religious belief that they could not, as one man, bow the knee in prayer to the Almighty, whose advice and assistance they hoped to obtain; and, independent as he was, and an enemy to all prelatry as he was known to be, he moved that Reverend Dushe, of the Episcopal Church, should address the throne of grace in prayer. John Adams, in his letter to his wife, says he never saw a more moving spectacle. Mr. Dushe read the Episcopal service of the church of England; and then, as if moved by the occasion, he broke out into extemporaneous prayer, and those men who were about to resort to force to obtain their rights were moved to tears; and floods of tears, he says, ran down the cheeks of pacific Quakers, who formed part of that interesting assembly; and depend upon it, that where there is spirit of Christianity, there is a spirit which rises above form, above ceremonies, independent of sect or creed, and the controversies of clashing doctrines." That same clergyman was afterward appointed chaplain of the American Congress. He had such an appointment 5 days after the Declaration of Independence.

On December 22, 1776; on December 13, 1784; and on February 29, 1788, it was resolved that two chaplains should be appointed. So far for the old American Congress.

There certainly can be no doubt as to the practice of employing chaplains in deliberating bodies previous to the adoption of the Constitution. We are, then, prepared to see if any change was made in that respect in the new order of affairs.

The First Congress under the Constitution began on the 4th of March, 1789; but there was not a quorum for business till the 1st of April. On the 9th of that month Oliver Ellsworth was appointed, on the part of the Senate, to confer with a committee of the House on Rules, and on the appointment of chaplains. The House chose five men—Boudinot, Bland, Tucker, Sherman, and Madison. The result of their consultation was a recommendation to appoint two chaplains of different denominations—one by the Senate and one by the House—to interchange weekly. The Senate appointed Dr. Provost, on the 25th of April.

On the 1st day of May Washington's first speech was read to the House, and the first business after that speech was the appointment of Dr. Linn as chaplain. By whom was this plan made? Three out of six of that joint committee were members of the convention that framed the Constitution. Madison, Ellsworth, and Sherman passed directly from the hall of the convention to the Hall of Congress. Did they not know what was constitutional? The law of 1789 was passed in compliance with their plan, giving chaplains a salary of \$500. It was reenacted in 1816, and continues to the present time. Chaplains have been appointed from all the leading denominations—Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Catholic, Unitarian, and others.

IV. EXCERPTS OF LETTER CONCERNING CHAPLAIN WILLIAM H. MILBURN

Replying to your letter of January 15, regarding the service of Reverend William H. Milburn as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I beg to state that he served from December 7, 1885, to March 3, 1893, during the 49th, 50th, 51st, and 52d Congresses.

He resided at 1318 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The 51st Congress was Republican. For Chaplain of the House the Reverend Charles B. Ramsdell was the Republican caucus nominee. A movement was started to retain Dr. Milburn, the former Chaplain, because he was blind and although a Democrat,

several Republicans voted for him and he was elected by a vote of 160 to 155.

In the 52d Congress he was reelected by a Democratic House without opposition and afterward became Chaplain of the Senate.

When "Tom" Reed was Speaker of the House, the Chaplain was the blind and eloquent orator Milburn. Milburn got into the habit of praying against gambling in stocks and bonds. Dunham, a stocky, swarthy Member of the House from Chicago, was a prominent member of the Chicago Stock Exchange.

So regular and persistent were the Chaplain's daily attacks upon "bucket shops" that Dunham, whose name figured prominently in certain doings in the Chicago "pit," went to "Tom" Reed and objected vehemently to what he said was getting "personal." Speaker Reed only smiled and in his inimitable drawl, said: "Aw, Dunham, don't mind that; it's only the Chaplain's way of telling the Lord all the news."²

V. EXCERPT FROM "HISTORY AND PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES" BY DE ALVA STANWOOD ALEXANDER, PAGES 89-99

The chaplain opens each day's session with prayer, for which he receives a salary of \$1,200 [1916]. It is not stipulated that prayers be short, or that Members stand during the service, but brevity and reverence are usually observed. Originally the chaplain was not an official of the House. A concurrent resolution named two clergymen of different denominations, who, interchanging weekly, supplied the Senate and House. The prolonged speakership contest in 1855 interrupted this custom, the House meantime employing local ministers. Their prayers, it seems, too often evinced something of the partisan spirit that characterized the pending controversy, and in the following Congress (1857) certain Members who claimed that the employment of chaplains conflicted with the spirit of the Constitution and tended to promote a union of church and state, made a determined effort to discontinue their use. This aroused the churches of the country, and at the end of an acrimonious debate the House, by an overwhelming majority, adopted the following resolution: "Whereas the people of the United States, from their earliest history to the present time, have been led by the hand of a kind providence and are indebted for the countless blessings of the past and the present and dependent for continued prosperity in the future upon Almighty God; and whereas the great vital and conservative element in our system is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it eminently becomes the representatives of a people so highly favored to acknowledge in the most public manner their reverence for God: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the daily sessions of this body be opened with prayer, and that the ministers of the Gospel in this city are hereby requested to attend and alternately perform this solemn duty."³ The adoption of this creed forever crushed objection to the presence of a chaplain. Nevertheless, his status remained unfixed. It was objected that neither the Constitution nor the law recognized such an officer, and not until the payment of his salary depended upon his taking the ironclad oath, adopted in 1862, did his official character become established.

VI. SELECTED, ADDITIONAL REFERENCES TO MATERIAL ON CHAPLAINS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Constitution, Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives of

¹ Letter from the Honorable William Tyler Page, Clerk of the House of Representatives, to Senator Harris, May 23, 1929.

² Letter from the Honorable William Tyler Page, minority clerk, House of Representatives, to Miss Lorene Martin, Virginia, Ill., Jan. 23, 1941.

³ 35th Cong., 1st Sess., Globe, pp. 25, 26.

the United States, 75th Congress," House Document No. 496, 74th Congress, 2d session, Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937.

See sections 621, 635, 655, and 878.

Hinds, Asher Crosby, "Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States," Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1937-41. Volume IX, p. 370. See references under chaplains.

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow, "Chaplains of the General Government," New York: Sheldon-Blakeman and Co., 1856. 82 pages. BV4375-J6 Toner Collection (Rare Book Room).

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow, "An Address to the Pastor and People of These United States on the Chaplaincy of the General Government," Washington: 1857. 31 pages. BR-516J6.

CHAPLAINS OF THE U.S. SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SELECTED REFERENCES

Alexander, De Alva Stanwood. History and Procedure of the House of Representatives. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946; pp. 98-99.

Constitution, Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953. See Rule II: Election of Officers; Rule I: Duties of the Speaker, sec. 621; Rule VII: Duties of the Chaplain; and Rule XXIV: Order of Business, sec. 878.

Hale, Edward Everett. Prayers in the Senate. Boston: Little, Brown, 1904. Prayers offered in winter session of 1904.

Hinds, Asher C. Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907. Vol. 1, secs. 187, 272-282.

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow. Chaplains of the General Government. New York: Sheldon-Blakeman, 1856; 82 pages.

Johnson, Lorenzo Dow. An address to the pastors and people of these United States on the chaplaincy of the general government. Washington, 1857. 31 pages.

Luce, Robert. Legislative Assemblies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924; pp. 602-612.

Marshall, Catherine. A Man Called Peter. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951; 354 pages. Includes account of experiences of Peter Marshall as Senate Chaplain.

Marshall, Peter. Prayers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954; 243 pages. Includes prayers in Senate.

The Pressure Upon Congress. Atlantic Monthly, February 1870, vol. 25, p. 150. Ascribed to James Parton.

Riddick, Floyd M. The U.S. Congress: Organization and Procedure. Manassas, Va.: National Capital Publishers, 1949; pp. 127, 133.

U.S. Congress. House. Prayers offered by the Chaplain * * * at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States. * * * Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1913. Covers period from 1895.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Prayers offered by the Chaplain * * * at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate at the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1929. Covers period from 1927.

WHY HASN'T CONGRESS BEEN ENTITLED TO THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CULTURAL CENTER?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Why hasn't Congress been entitled to the truth about the Cultural Center?

According to a page 1 report in the New York Times of February 18, 1964, the guidance of the cultural affairs of the United States is to be placed in the hands of one individual. According to the report, the cultural affairs of the Federal Government are to be organized and directed by the New York theatrical producer, Roger L. Stevens, who has been serving since 1961 as the Board Chairman of the National Cultural Center and, presumably, will continue in this post as well.

Before President Johnson makes final his decision regarding this concentration of the art activities of the Federal Government in the hands of Mr. Stevens, I would hope he would take another look at the financial affairs of the Cultural Center and the misinformation given to the Congress regarding it.

I would think that the President would want to concern himself about some of these actions which our distinguished colleague, Senator ELLENDER, has called "slick parliamentary practices." I would further think that the President would at this time be particularly sensitive to the possible conflict of interest which arises from having an active commercial theatrical producer in such an influential Federal post as the Presidential Adviser on National Cultural Affairs at the White House.

It is extremely significant, I think, that Mr. Stevens as Board Chairman of the National Cultural Center has told Congress that he sees this project as so much real estate. It would seem to me that a loftier view should be taken of the National Cultural Center, and of the arts and artists, than the real estate view.

Speaking of real estate, in December of 1963 and January of this year, increasing numbers of Members of Congress, including myself, became concerned with many unsound aspects of the hastily contrived change in financial planning for the National Cultural Center. We were suddenly confronted with a piece of legislation that had literally been drafted overnight and which alarmed many of us by compounding a series of questionable fiscal actions by the trustees of the Cultural Center. The amended act, as finally adopted by Congress, included a provision for a first mortgage on a Presidential memorial, something that has never been proposed before in our history. At the time many of our distinguished colleagues and I looked upon this aspect of the amended Cultural Center Act with deep concern and we were supported in our views by a thoughtful editorial in the New York Times of January 7, 1964, which said in part:

The National Cultural Center should stand on its own merits. The proposal to finance it now in important part through public money is a complete reversal of the original plan, which was that the Federal Government would provide only the site. Further-

more, as Mr. WIDNALL points out, the Government is in effect pledging itself to provide annual operating funds to keep the project solvent—because obviously a Presidential memorial cannot be allowed to go bankrupt. In addition, the provision for a loan of \$15.4 million for construction of parking facilities is, as Mr. WIDNALL says, tantamount to putting "a first mortgage on a Presidential memorial for the first time in our history."

The announced purpose of the mortgage loan was to finance an underground parking facility for some 1,600 cars by means of a U.S. Treasury loan of \$15.4 million—coming to an unprecedented cost of \$10,000 per car. Chairman Roger Stevens, of the Cultural Center, acknowledged under committee questioning that the foreseeable annual net income from this parking facility would not be sufficient to pay the annual interest on such a loan, still less allow provision for paying off any part of the principal.

Many members recorded their opposition to this measure under very difficult circumstances.

A new proposal has just been sent to Congress by President Johnson which bears seriously on the continuing financial problems of the Cultural Center. The request by the President, dated February 13, 1964, is but another chapter in a sorry history. This comes as a request for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1964 and it divides itself into two parts. First, a request for immediately appropriating the \$15.5 million in matching funds that the Congress authorized in January. The President is requesting that we appropriate these funds immediately rather than waiting until the Cultural Center trustees have enough funds in hand from private sources to build the Cultural Center when combined with the Federal grant. Our matching funds should only be about \$9 million at this point. The circumstances of this request are enough to warrant the Appropriations Committee to make a careful examination before releasing such funds. A second White House request is for the sum of \$3.3 million to acquire additional land for the Cultural Center. This is \$3.3 million over and above the \$15.5 million that have been authorized as a matching grant and over and above the \$15.4 million that have been authorized as a loan—a loan that is openly unpayable and therefore should also be considered realistically as a grant. So now suddenly we have a \$50 million Cultural Center instead of the \$30 million Center that we thought we had authorized. This is one of the fastest cases of inflation in the history of finance. More will undoubtedly follow.

My study of the new proposal to acquire more than double the acreage originally authorized by Congress and the associated background events leads me regretfully to the conclusion that matters have gone so far that the Congress and public are being badly misled.

I became concerned about the land problem relating to the Cultural Center when the revised architectural plans were presented to the public in Newport, R.I., in September of 1962. At that time it appeared to me that the building was not adapted to the site which Congress

had authorized in 1958. Upon investigation I found that this indeed was the case: that the architect and the trustees had designed and authorized a building which in part must occupy land that was never assigned to them by the act of Congress under which they exist. The proposed site on which Congress voted and which is reproduced pictorially in the published hearings of the Senate Committee on Public Works, and which is carefully described in section 3 of the National Cultural Center Act, consists of about 9 acres of which 1 acre, we were told in the committee report in 1958, was not yet in Government hands in 1958 and would have to be acquired. In the Senate committee hearings, in the House committee hearings and on the floors of both Houses of Congress it was firmly stated by the proponents of this bill that the cost of this additional land acquisition to the Federal Government would be about \$650,000. This, then, is the landsite and the price of acquisition that was covered by the bill presented to Congress, and it is the only bill of this sort that Congress has ever acted on in connection with the Cultural Center.

It is self-evident that the trustees of the Center knew that their architect was exceeding the authorized site. It is more than self-evident, because the publicity issued by the Center has regularly, during the Stevens regime, been referring to 13 acres rather than the 9 acres authorized by Congress. At a meeting of the executive committee of the trustees which took place on January 18, 1963, it was noted that the building plans did not conform to the authorized site and that "the officers are developing legislation to expand the present site . . . sufficiently for the purposes of creating upon it the building design approved by the board of trustees."

The summary of actions of the executive committee reflects this.

The concern of the trustees that legislation in the form of an amendment to the National Cultural Center Act would be necessary to expand the site was correct. It was so correct that, at the urging of the trustees, Senator DIRKSEN has a bill in the present Congress (S. 315) that would amend section 3 of the act so that the Center would have the legislative authority to occupy the land that the President of the United States now seeks to acquire without such legislative authority.

The existence of Senator DIRKSEN's bill, and the fact that it was introduced a year ago, is extremely significant. Since the trustees knew that the additional land would be necessary for the building they had already approved, and since they had encouraged Senator DIRKSEN to introduce his bill, why was not this amendment brought to Congress last summer, at the time we were asked to pass legislation amending the act to allow the National Cultural Center to continue operations for 3 years? Why did not President Johnson send along this important amendment with the other extensive amendments he sent to Congress in December 1963 in con-

nection with the change of name and financial plan?

The facts appear to justify the view that this plan of action was designed for the purpose of encouraging Congress to approve something it might not have approved if the full story were known. Because I was aware of the inconsistencies between the architect's plans and the authorized site I asked the following question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] on the floor of the House on August 5, 1963:

Is any further acquisition of land contemplated for the Cultural Center?

This is his reply:

No, there is none, or it would be considered along with this legislation. There has been no request for additional land in the last 2 years that I know anything about. There was about 3 years ago a request for additional land. The Public Works Committee took the position that we have already supplied a sufficient amount of land to accommodate the need.

You will find this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 11, page 14076.

Once again, I became concerned about this issue during the December hearings before the Public Works Committee, chaired by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I was alarmed by certain testimony by one of the trustees and I stated during my own testimony:

I believe also it will be necessary to pass further enabling legislation if they are going to acquire additional property and it seems that they have that in mind.

And here is the reply of the gentleman from Alabama:

There is no authority in this bill for the trustees to acquire any more property. Mr. WIDNALL.

You will find this exchange on page 69 of the published hearings for December 16, 1963. It is now only 2 months later and we suddenly find that the assurances we have been given, in regard to the land, do not really stand up; and now the President himself is backing a plan to acquire more than double the originally authorized acreage and to do so without any enabling legislation at all. If it was necessary to pass legislation in 1958 under President Eisenhower to set aside 9 acres of land, why is not legislation necessary to set aside 9 additional acres now under President Johnson?

As we look more deeply into this land problem we find that the trustees have purchased real estate in the Nation's Capital. For the first time in their presentations to Congress, the trustees provided a current balance sheet which is included in the published hearings of December 12 and 16, 1963, that I have just cited. On this balance sheet there appears an extraordinary entry under fixed assets where we find:

Cost of land \$146,000

Now why should the National Cultural Center balance sheet show land ownership as an asset when, under the act, the one thing that was to be provided by the Federal Government was the land. Under section 3 of the act the only authority for anybody to acquire land for the Na-

tional Cultural Center is vested in the National Capital Planning Commission. The act clearly specifies, and the legislative history proves, that the National Cultural Center trustees were not authorized by law to acquire the land on which the building is to stand. That being the case, how can any portion of that land be shown as a capital asset?

Thus, investigation reveals the trustees arranging to acquire land outside the authorized site and adjacent to it and becoming behind-the-scenes parties to a purchase of private real estate in direct conflict with the limitations of the act from which they derive their authority to exist. The records of the U.S. district Court show that the actual conveyance of this private property came about as the result of a condemnation proceeding by the National Capital Planning Commission and that the NCPC appears in these records as the buyer of this land. Yet, it shows up on the November 30, 1963, balance sheet of the National Cultural Center as a capital asset of the Center.

To add to this unusual real estate transaction and accounting, we must now consider the recent revelation in the Washington Evening Star of the fact that still another privately owned tract of land outside the authorized site—one that is essential to the building as planned by the architect and approved by the trustees—is now under contract of sale from one private owner to another. I refer to the famous Watergate Inn which was sold with its one-fourth acre of ground for \$900,000 to a group of investors and on which settlement is scheduled to take place March 3, 1964.

At first glance it might appear that this is land speculation based on someone's belief that the Federal Government would authorize the purchase, and pay a handsome profit, in order to acquire this land for the National Cultural Center. The facts as given to the press by the buyer and seller show the complete opposite to be the case. They show that both the buyer and the seller conscientiously tried to determine by direct questions to the trustees of the Center if this land was still essential to the project. They failed to obtain any appropriate information and so they proceeded, as American citizens have the right to do, to sign their contract.

Step by step, this Congress and the American people which it represents have been led to grant more and more of the taxpayers' dollars to a venture that becomes more inflated by the minute.

We are already on notice that today's demand for \$3.3 million for additional land is not the end. The Washington Post of February 14 reports that the architect now has plans for tunneling Rock Creek Parkway under the Cultural Center building to improve the vista. Is there anyone in this Congress who would care to give even a wild guess as to what that might cost, especially in the lowlands adjacent to the Potomac River? I think it is safe to say that it will involve many millions of dollars. It is equally prophetic to say that whatever it costs, the millions will be tacked into some

other convenient budget, presumably that for highways or parks under the direction of Mr. Stevens, as Presidential Cultural Adviser.

It might be well to make a short list of the steps which have led Congress into the serious mess with which we are now confronted in this Cultural Center project.

First. The size of the site and the repeated statements that no further land would be needed.

Second. The price of additional land. Until the last 60 days the only additional money for land noted in the history of the legislation is \$650,000. Now, for today's bite, we are being asked for \$3.3 million.

Third. The concealment of the need for extra land. In spite of the existence of a bill (S. 315) which Senator DIRKSEN introduced at the request of the Cultural Center trustees to enlarge the site by amendment, this vital matter was not exposed to Congress on either of two occasions during the past 8 months when Congress was considering other amendments to the same bill. Now the President suggests purchasing the additional acreage without legislative authority.

Fourth. The cost of construction. With great publicity it was announced by Mr. Roger Stevens in September 1962 that the Cultural Center could be built for \$30 million based on the plans at that time. The publicity material of the Cultural Center consistently mentioned parking in connection with the Cultural Center so that donors, Congress, and the general public were lulled into believing that the cost of the parking facilities were included in the \$30 million price tag. It was revealed for the first time in December 1963 that the so-called parking garage was not included and that it would cost an unprecedented \$15.4 million to build.

Fifth. The nature of the parking garage. Part of the explanation of the high cost of the so-called parking garage arises from the fact that the cost of this structure includes the actual foundations of the theaters above as well as many working components of those theaters. It follows that these components of the so-called parking garage are what account for the major part of the high cost, and, of course, have nothing to do with parking. Many competent observers doubt that this will actually work, because the hastily contrived act authorizes the Treasury loan only for a parking garage and appears not to authorize such a loan for any part of the Cultural Center structure itself. In any event, the method of presentation was flagrantly misleading. This was intensified by the report of the Committee on Public Works—No. 1050—which notes that the parking facility "includes the foundation, loads of the structure above, the vertical circulation, and space for mechanical services of the structure above." Although this material is included in the report, apparently at the last moment just before going to press, it was not the subject of testimony in the hearings, nor of House debate on January 8, 1964.

Sixth. The reporting of gift income. Each time that Congress has considered the Cultural Center legislation it has received rosy statements concerning the ease with which voluntary contributions could be solicited. The first such representations came from Mr. Robert Dowling, the chairman of the Advisory Committee, who testified in 1958 that the necessary funds could be raised publicly in a matter of months. His business partner, Roger Stevens, who is the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, used the White House as a forum last summer to state that he already had \$15 million in hand in private gifts. Yet, by December, when appearing before Congress, Mr. Stevens was able to account for only some \$13 million, including a conditional grant of \$5 million from the Ford Foundation which has never been fully described to Congress. A fundraising concert dinner held at the National Guard Armory in Washington a little over a year ago and telecast by closed circuit to the rest of the Nation was claimed in advance by Mr. Stevens as an activity that would raise \$5 million for the Cultural Center. Not only was this event universally denounced as an artistic failure but, according to the financial statements of the Cultural Center, it produced some paltry \$300,000 in funds which is a far cry from \$5 million.

This dismal history is the more disheartening because it serves as the background to a project that was created with the loftiest of intentions: An arts center for the Capital City of the United States. And it was renamed with equally lofty intent as the Washington memorial for a much beloved President of the United States, President Kennedy. The National Cultural Center was renamed with the support of all Members of Congress.

At the time, serious questions were raised about the financing and maintenance of the Cultural Center. We now find that the Cultural Center Board Chairman, under whom most of the "slick parliamentary practices" have taken place, is being considered for appointment by the President as the cultural czar of the United States—that he is to be given the White House post as Presidential Cultural Adviser, in addition to his post as Board Chairman of the Cultural Center.

Even if Mr. Stevens is the ideal man for this post, I think that all of the foregoing clouded issues relating to his administration of the Cultural Center should be resolved to the satisfaction of all before President Johnson can, in good conscience, give him unlimited control over the cultural destiny of the United States. The President should also concern himself with the obvious conflict of interest which will continue to prevail and be increased when Mr. Stevens, as a Broadway producer, is faced with the tantalizing prospect of booking his own commercial productions into the Cultural Center of which he is the Board Chairman.

It is my hope that the House Appropriations Committee give thorough scru-

tiny to the pending appropriation requests for the construction of the Cultural Center.

RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS—LIGHTS OFF AT THE WHITE HOUSE—LIGHTS UP HOPE FOR MILLIONS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the imposition of residual oil quotas has long been a matter of concern to thoughtful citizens living on the eastern seaboard. The battle to remove these unfair quotas has been fought here in the House on a broad bipartisan front for many years.

Now that we have a President who has demonstrated his concern for economy, there is new hope that these costly quotas will be removed. By turning off the lights at the White House, President Johnson has given the Nation and the whole world tangible evidence of the importance of economy. Certainly, when fully apprised of the facts, he will help millions of Americans located on the eastern seaboard and far removed from the mineral resources so richly bestowed on some parts of our Nation, to help reduce their light bills, too.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have written to the President suggesting that, just as he has cut the light bill at the White House by a flick of a switch, he can help New England and eastern seaboard homeowners reduce their light bills, too, by a stroke of the Presidential pen.

My letter to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your successful efforts to reduce the electric light bills in the White House have been widely noted. This tangible evidence of your pledge for economy in Government has received well-deserved praise. Believing with you that economy in Government is an important and attainable goal, I commend your efforts and the example you have set. In New Hampshire we still have a high regard for thrift, and despite the scoffing of Government economists, we still view the Puritan ethic with esteem.

Because of your interest in economy, permit me to suggest the next logical step.

For 5 years, 50 million consumers along the east coast from Maine to Florida have been trying to do what you have accomplished in 1 month—reduce their own light bills. They have tried to do this by seeking the removal of residual fuel oil controls, which have been costing consumers in New England alone close to \$30 million a year in increased light bills and heating costs.

Removal of these residual fuel oil controls, Mr. President, can be accomplished by you and you alone, not by a "flip of a switch" but by "a stroke of a pen." They are unneeded and unnecessary, both from the standpoint of our national security and the

safeguarding of our domestic petroleum industry. By putting the lights out in the White House, and by doing away with a useless system of Government controls, you can help 50 million Americans and can further prove that economy in this era of hundred-billion-dollar budgets, does truly begin at home.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS—IS IT THE ANSWER FOR YOUR SON OR DAUGHTER?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as the crush of young people desiring higher education puts an ever greater strain on our educational resources and our imagination, one possible solution may be greater attention to junior colleges. In the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, we reserved a substantial portion of our funds for junior community colleges. Junior colleges of business are now receiving greater study as one means of channeling students into the educational environment best suited for them. C. Fred Burdett, president of Burdett College of Boston, Mass., recently wrote a fine article describing the advantages of junior business colleges. The article appeared in a number of Massachusetts newspapers and I would like my colleagues to have the benefit of its contents:

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS—IS IT THE ANSWER FOR YOUR SON OR DAUGHTER?

(By C. Fred Burdett, president, Burdett College, Boston)

Every high school class produces a certain number of students who are slated for a college degree, another group who have an affinity for tools and trade, and a third group, the largest, who fall into the so-called general and business classifications.

The road ahead for the first two groups is fairly well defined. College selection and admission for one, choice of technical school or apprenticeship for the other.

Not so for the third group—the students who are not sure they want to (or can) go on for 4 more years of school, who may not have taken college preparatory courses, or who want to achieve maximum employability in the shortest possible time. These youngsters should continue their education, especially the many who are good students and would benefit by college-level instruction. A high school diploma is no longer adequate preparation for employment—the complexities of this age make additional training essential for advancement.

So, what should they do—what educational avenue is open that will enhance their chances of success?

Like their counterparts who will go on for a degree, most of these young men and women will carve careers in some form of business. Accordingly, they should have as much of the best business training as possible. And they can, through one of the most rapidly growing, but least publicized areas of education—that the accredited junior college of business. Specifically, accredited junior

colleges of business because accreditation is indicative of high standards and a specialized 2-year curriculum of business subjects that in general is equivalent in technical content to those offered by 4-year institutions.

There are over 40 such junior colleges of business in the country. All set rigid admissions standards as to grades, interest, and recommendations, but college preparatory courses and college boards, examinations, while helpful, are usually not required. Educational programs are coordinated to the requirements of business and planned to provide an understanding of business philosophy and ethics as well as training in definite subject areas—i.e., in the coeducational colleges, accounting, marketing, management, and secretarial specializations.

Yearly costs vary throughout the country but generally are somewhat lower per year than those of the 4-year private college. Total costs, again in approximate terms, are roughly one-half or less.

Student life is much similar to that at other colleges, includes periodic guidance and counseling interviews, well-rounded extracurricular activities programs, sponsored travel, discussion groups, etc. Some students commute, some live in dorms—many come from the immediate locale, but others are also attracted from many parts of the world.

While programs are largely terminal in nature, many junior colleges of business have established transfer relations with 4-year institutions. Students from these junior colleges of business, while prepared for immediate employment, may also transfer after graduation and go on for a degree. Those who do want immediate employment will find placement offices active and a certain amount of recruiting. Employers are rapidly learning that the junior college of business is an excellent source of personnel who need only a minimum amount of on-the-job training.

Students, and their parents, who feel that this may be the answer to their educational needs should talk first to the high school guidance directors and then to the admissions officer of the college best suited to their particular requirements. A complete list of accredited junior colleges of business may be obtained from James R. Taylor, executive secretary, Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Wayne University, Detroit 2, Mich.

THE NEW PUBLIC LAW 480 AGREEMENT WITH POLAND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes fail to recognize the effectiveness of our food-for-peace programs, the Public Law 480 programs, and occasionally we hear complaints that the people in a foreign country are not aware of the Public Law 480 agreements between the United States and that particular country. Such misgivings have certainly been expressed in the past with respect to our agreements with Poland.

I should like to take this occasion to draw attention to the publicity in Poland about the recently concluded Public Law 480 agreement. On February 4, 1964, the day after the agreement was signed, all four major Warsaw daily newspapers

front-paged the new agreement. Similar publicity was given in the provincial press throughout Poland and the Polish radio also reported the new agreement.

The Polish news reports accurately reported the composition and terms of the agreement which provide for the sale of \$90 million worth of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities. The new agreement consists of three parts: One part provides that Poland will convert into dollars, over a 3-year period, the local currency proceeds derived from \$30 million worth of sales; the second part provides for a \$30 million conversion over an extended period of years; that is, the same terms contained in our previous agreements; and the third portion provides for the commercial purchase of \$30 million worth of agricultural commodities in the United States during 1964.

I also note with satisfaction the published comments of the Polish Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade who earlier this month visited the United States and met with Members of the House and Senate as well as with officials in the executive branch. The Minister declared that he expected the recent Public Law 480 agreement "to pave the road toward normalization and the development of economic and trade relations between Poland and the United States."

I am happy that the Polish Government demonstrated its appreciation of the Public Law 480 agreement by giving it such prominent publicity. There is no doubt in my mind that the Polish people are aware of and appreciate the receipt of food and other agricultural commodities from the United States. It is another reminder of the ties between the United States and the Polish peoples.

For my part, I am pleased to note that the new Public Law 480 agreement with Poland represents a significant step toward placing the trade relations between the United States and Poland on a broader commercial basis.

One-third of the agricultural commodities involved in the Public Law 480 agreement with Poland are to be purchased on a commercial basis in 1964. One-third are to be paid for with zlotys which can be converted into dollars over a 3-year period. Only the remaining one-third of the commodities in this agreement are being sold on relatively soft terms—the same terms contained in our previous Public Law 480 agreements with Poland—which enable that country to pay for them with zlotys and to convert those zlotys into dollars over an extended period of years. I believe this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a translation of an article which appeared in the February 7, 1964, issue of Trybuna Ludu, as well as the text of the Department of State release of February 3, 1964, containing the most recent Public Law 480 agreement with Poland:

[From Trybuna Ludu, Feb. 7, 1964]

VICE MINISTER MODRZEWSKI ON THE COURSE OF ECONOMIC TALKS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In a talk held with PAP correspondent editor Zwirne, Vice Minister of Foreign Trade Franciszek Modrzewski recalled that the

Polish-American trade agreement signed on February 3, 1964, represents the seventh successive agreement of this type since 1957. "However, the present agreement", pointed out Vice Minister Modrzewski, "introduces certain new provisions indicating a comparatively universal development of our relations in the purchase of agricultural products from the United States. This agreement covers the purchase of these products by Poland for the amount of approximately \$90 million, one-third of which is on terms of long-term credit in agreement with Public Law 480 covering agricultural surplus, one-third of which is on 3-year credit without interest (this is something new) and is also subject to the regulations of Public Law 480, and one-third of which is for cash. At the same time it has been established with the Export-Import Bank that operations conducted on a normal commercial basis can be financed on the basis of 18 months' credit."

"The signing of the current agreement should pave the road toward normalization and the development of economic and trade relations between Poland and the United States. Both in government as well as in the bank and trade circles it has been possible to notice the existence of a better and I would say even a more promising atmosphere in the field of Polish-American trade, thanks to last year's reintroduction of the most-favored-nation clause for Poland by Congress. Although not all obstacles on the road toward the development of Polish-American trade have been removed—here I have in mind certain legislative restrictions—it is hoped that this atmosphere will permit Poland to considerably increase her exports to the American market in 1964 and subsequent years, this being closely connected with the refund of credits. The list of Polish goods sold on this market already comprises approximately 250 items."

"As far as Polish purchases in the United States are concerned they already have a 7-year tradition, and the signing of this year's agreement indicates that they will also grow."

"In the beginning the purpose of my visit, planned for 1 week, was to hold general talks on the prospects for the development of trade relations between our two countries. This visit, however, was extended to 2½ weeks in connection with the negotiations for the conclusion of the present agreement. I am satisfied with the talks held on a high level with the representatives of the American Government, with the Members of the Congress, and with bank and economic representatives. The talks were objective and were held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding."

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC UNDER TITLE I OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT, AS AMENDED

Agreements providing for the sale to Poland of agricultural commodities were signed today in Washington by George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, and Franciszek Modrzewski, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of the Polish People's Republic. Within the framework of the agreed arrangement, Poland will purchase surplus agricultural commodities, including wheat, cotton, edible oils, rice, and tobacco, having a total export market value of \$90.9 million, including certain ocean transportation costs.

As provided in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480), purchases under the act will be paid for in local currency (Polish zlotys). This currency will be deposited to the credit of the United States and will be available for use by the U.S. Government. Under one agreement the Polish Government is scheduled to commence by December 31, 1964, and

to complete by December 31, 1967, the repurchase for dollars of the unused zloty proceeds from \$30.2 million worth of commodities. A second agreement concluded on the same terms as in previous Public Law 480 agreements with Poland provides that beginning January 1974, the Polish Government will repurchase for dollars, at the annual rate of \$750,000, the remaining balance of zloty proceeds derived from the sale of \$30.7 million worth of commodities.

Poland has also undertaken, in connection with these arrangements, to purchase with its own resources from the United States during 1964 an additional 200,000 metric tons of feed grains, 66,000 bales of cotton, 5,500 metric tons of edible oil or tallow, 10,000 metric tons of rice, and other U.S. agricultural commodities to bring the total purchases to \$30 million. These purchases are over and above the amounts to be purchased for the zloty equivalent of \$60.9 million mentioned above.

These agreements represent another step of the U.S. Government to meet Polish needs by sales of agricultural commodities, while at the same time encouraging further the trend in recent years to expand the commercial basis of the economic relations between the United States and Poland. Since 1957 agreements under Public Law 480 have provided for a total of \$538.2 million in such sales to Poland, including the sales agreements signed today.

The texts of the present agreements follow:

AGREEMENT A

(Long-term agreement)

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Polish People's Republic:

Recognizing the desirability of expanding trade in agricultural commodities between their two countries in a manner which would not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities;

Considering that the purchase for Polish zlotys of agricultural commodities produced in the United States of America will assist in achieving such an expansion of trade;

Desiring to set forth the understandings which will govern the sales, as specified below, of agricultural commodities to Poland pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act) and the measures which the two Governments will take individually and collectively in furthering the expansion of trade in such commodities;

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

Sales for Polish Zlotys

1. Subject to issuance by the Government of the United States of America and acceptance by the Government of the Polish People's Republic of purchase authorizations and to the availability of commodities under the act at the time of exportation, the Government of the United States of America undertakes to finance the sales for Polish zlotys, to purchasers authorized by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, of the following agricultural commodities in the amounts indicated:

[In millions]

Commodity:	Export market value
Wheat.....	\$9.7
Cotton.....	5.7
Edible oil.....	10.8
Tobacco (leaf).....	2.6
Ocean transportation (estimated).....	1.9
Total.....	30.7

2. Applications for purchase authorizations will be made within 90 calendar days after the effective date of this agreement, except that applications for purchase authorizations for any additional commodities or amounts of commodities provided for in any amendment to this agreement will be made within 90 days after the effective date of such amendment. Purchase authorizations will include provisions relating to the sale and delivery of commodities, the time and circumstances of deposit of Polish zlotys accruing from such sale, and other relevant matters.

3. The financing, sale, and delivery of commodities under this agreement may be terminated by either Government if that Government determines that because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale, or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable.

Article II

Uses of Zlotys

1. The two Governments agree that the zlotys accruing to the Government of the United States of America as a consequence of the sales made pursuant to this agreement may be used by the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with section 104 of the act, to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities under subsection (a) thereof; to finance the purchase of goods or services for other countries under subsection (d) thereof; to pay U.S. obligations under subsection (f) thereof; to finance educational exchange activities under subsection (h) thereof; to finance the translations, publication and distribution of books and periodicals under subsection (i) thereof; and for other expenditures by the Government of the United States of America under subsections (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (q), and (r) thereof.

2. The zlotys accruing under the agreement may be expended by the Government of the United States of America, for the purposes stated in paragraph 1 of this article, in such manner and order of priority as the Government of the United States of America shall determine. It is understood that, with respect to the purchase of goods or services for other countries, the types, quantities, and prices will be subject to negotiation between the two Governments.

Article III

Deposit of Zlotys

1. The amount of Polish zlotys to be deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America shall be the equivalent of the dollar sales value of the commodities and ocean transportation costs reimbursed or financed by the Government of the United States of America (except excess costs resulting from the requirement that U.S.-flag vessels be used) converted into zlotys, as follows:

(a) At the rate for dollar exchange applicable to commercial import transactions on the dates of dollar disbursements by the United States, provided that a unitary exchange rate applying to all foreign exchange transactions is maintained by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or

(b) If more than one legal rate for foreign exchange transactions exists, at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar) established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the dates of dollar disbursement by the Government of the United States of America.

2. Any refunds of Polish zlotys which may become due under this agreement may be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available under this agreement. Any refunds of Polish zlotys which may be due or become due under any prior agreement under the act for which undistributed funds are no longer available in the accounts of the Government of the

United States of America in Poland may be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available under this agreement. In the event that a subsequent agricultural commodities agreement or agreements should be signed by the two Governments under the act, any refunds of zlotys which may be due or become due under this agreement more than 2 years from the effective date of this agreement would be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available from the most recent agricultural agreement in effect at the time of the refund.

3. The two Governments agree that the following procedures shall apply with respect to the zlotys deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America under this agreement:

(a) On the date of the deposit of such zlotys to the account of the United States they shall, at the same rate of exchange at which they were deposited, be converted and transferred to a special dollar-denominated account to the credit of the U.S. Government in the National Bank of Poland.

(b) Withdrawals in zlotys from such special dollar-denominated account by the United States for uses referred to in article II of this agreement other than the purchase of goods or services for other countries shall be paid by the National Bank of Poland at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar) established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the date of the withdrawal, provided that if such rate is more appreciated than the rate at which zlotys were deposited under paragraph 1 of this article, the rate in paragraph 1 shall apply.

(c) Payment for purchases of goods or services for other countries referred to in article II of this agreement shall be made by reducing the balance in the dollar-denominated account by an amount equal to the dollar prices of such purchases agreed upon by the two Governments.

(d) If any unused balance remains in such special dollar denominated account on and after January 2, 1974, the Government of the Polish People's Republic agrees that, if the Government of the United States of America shall so elect, the National Bank of Poland will sell to the Government of the United States the sum of \$750,000 in dollar exchange annually, beginning January 2, 1974, and on each succeeding January 2, such dollar exchanges to be paid for by reducing the balance in the dollar denominated account by the same amount.

Article IV

General Undertakings

1. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will take all possible measures to prevent the resale or transshipment to other countries or the use for other than domestic purposes of the agricultural commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement (except where such resale, transshipment or use is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America); to prevent the export of any commodity of either domestic or foreign origin which is the same as the commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement during the period beginning on the date of this agreement and ending with the final date on which such commodities are received and utilized (except where such export is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America), and to assure that the purchase of such commodities does not result in increased availability of these or like commodities for export to other countries.

2. The two Governments will take reasonable precautions to assure that all sales and purchases of agricultural commodities pursuant to this agreement will not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly

disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities.

3. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will furnish quarterly information on the progress of the program, particularly with respect to the arrival and condition of commodities; provisions for the maintenance of usual marketings as described in paragraph 1 of the letter accompanying the agreement; and information relating to imports and exports of the same or like commodities.

Article V

Consultation

The two Governments will, upon request of either of them, consult regarding any matter relating to the application of this agreement, or to the operation of arrangements carried out pursuant to this agreement.

Article VI

Entry Into Force

This agreement shall enter into force upon signature.

In witness whereof, the respective representatives, duly authorized for the purpose, have signed the present agreement.

Done in duplicate at Washington, D.C. in the English and Polish languages this 3d day of February 1964.

For the Government of the United States of America:

GEORGE W. BALL

For the Government of the Polish People's Republic:

FRANCISZEK MODRZEWSKI

AGREEMENT B

(Three year agreement)

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Polish People's Republic:

Recognizing the desirability of expanding trade in agricultural commodities between their two countries in a manner which would not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities;

Considering that the purchase for Polish zlotys of agricultural commodities produced in the United States of America will assist in achieving such an expansion of trade;

Desiring to set forth the understandings which will govern the sales, as specified below, of agricultural commodities to Poland pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act), and the measures which the two Governments will take individually and collectively in furthering the expansion of trade in such commodities;

Have agreed as follows:

Article I

Sales for Polish Zlotys

1. Subject to issuance by the Government of the United States of America and acceptance by the Government of the Polish People's Republic of purchase authorizations and to the availability of commodities under the act at the time of exportation, the Government of the United States of America undertakes to finance the sales for Polish zlotys, to purchasers authorized by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, of the following agricultural commodities in the amounts indicated:

[In millions]

Commodity:	Export market value
Wheat.....	\$21.0
Rice.....	1.4
Cotton.....	4.8
Ocean transportation (estimated).....	3.0
Total.....	30.2

2. Applications for purchase authorizations will be made within 90 calendar days after the effective date of this agreement, except

that applications for purchase authorizations for any additional commodities or amounts of commodities provided for in any amendment to this agreement will be made within 90 days after the effective date of such amendment. Purchase authorizations will include provisions relating to the sale and delivery of commodities, the time and circumstances of deposit of Polish zlotys accruing from such sale, and other relevant matters.

3. The financing, sale and delivery of commodities under this agreement may be terminated by either Government if that Government determines that because of changed conditions the continuation of such financing, sale or delivery is unnecessary or undesirable.

Article II

Uses of Zlotys

1. The two Governments agree that the zlotys accruing to the Government of the United States of America as a consequence of the sales made pursuant to this agreement may be used by the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with section 104 of the act, to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities under subsection (a) thereof; to finance the purchase of goods or services for other countries under subsection (d) thereof; to pay U.S. obligations under subsection (f) thereof; to finance educational exchange activities under subsection (h) thereof; to finance the translation, publication, and distribution of books and periodicals under subsection (i) thereof; and for other expenditures by the Government of the United States of America under subsections (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (q), and (r) thereof.

2. The zlotys accruing under the agreement may be expended by the Government of the United States of America, for the purposes stated in paragraph 1 of this article, in such manner and order of priority as the Government of the United States of America shall determine. It is understood that, with respect to the purchase of goods or services for other countries, the types, quantities, and prices will be subject to negotiation between the two Governments.

Article III

Deposit of Zlotys

1. The amount of Polish zlotys to be deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America shall be the equivalent of the dollar sales value of the commodities and ocean transportation costs reimbursed or financed by the Government of the United States of America (except excess costs resulting from the requirement that U.S.-flag vessels be used) converted into Polish zlotys, as follows:

(a) At the rate for dollar exchange applicable to commercial import transactions on the dates of dollar disbursements by the United States, provided that a unitary exchange rate applying to all foreign exchange transactions is maintained by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or

(b) If more than one legal rate for foreign exchange transactions exists, at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar) established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the dates of dollar disbursement by the Government of the United States of America.

2. Any refunds of Polish zlotys which may be due or become due under this agreement more than 2 years from the effective date of this agreement may be made by the Government of the United States of America from funds available in the accounts of the Government of the United States of America in Poland other than those accruing under this agreement:

3. The two Governments agree that the following procedure shall apply with respect

to the zlotys deposited to the account of the Government of the United States of America under this agreement:

(a) On the date of the deposit of such zlotys to the account of the United States they shall, at the same rate of exchange at which they were deposited, be converted and transferred to a special dollar-denominated account to the credit of the U.S. Government in the National Bank of Poland.

(b) Withdrawals in zlotys from such special dollar-denominated account by the United States for uses referred to in article II of this agreement other than the purchase of goods or services for other countries shall be paid by the National Bank of Poland at the highest of any rate of exchange (i.e., the largest number of zlotys per U.S. dollar), established by the Government of the Polish People's Republic, or any agency thereof, prevailing on the date of the withdrawal, provided that if such rate is more appreciated than the rate at which zlotys were deposited under paragraph I of this article, the rate in paragraph I shall apply.

(c) Payment for purchases of goods or services for other countries referred to in article II of this agreement shall be made by reducing the balance in the dollar-denominated account by an amount equal to the dollar prices of such purchases agreed upon by the two governments.

(d) If any unused balance remains in such special dollar-denominated account on and after December 31, 1964, the Government of the Polish People's Republic agrees that, if the Government of the United States of America should so elect, the National Bank of Poland will sell to the Government of the United States in dollar exchange on January 2, 1965, the sum of \$3 million; on January 2, 1967, the sum of \$9 million; on July 1, 1967, the sum of \$9 million; and on January 2, 1968, the remaining balance in such special dollar-denominated account, such dollar exchange to be paid for by reducing the balance in the dollar-denominated account by the same amount.

Article IV

General Undertakings

1. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will take all possible measures to prevent the resale or transshipment to other countries or the use for other than domestic purposes of the agricultural commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement (except where such resale, transshipment, or use is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America); to prevent the export of any commodity of either domestic or foreign origin which is the same as the commodities purchased pursuant to this agreement during the period beginning on the date of this agreement and ending with the final date on which such commodities are received and utilized (except where such export is specifically approved by the Government of the United States of America), and to assure that the purchase of such commodities does not result in increased availability of these or like commodities for export to other countries.

2. The two Governments will take reasonable precautions to assure that all sales and purchases of agricultural commodities pursuant to this agreement will not displace usual marketings of the United States of America in these commodities or unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities.

3. The Government of the Polish People's Republic will furnish quarterly information on the progress of the program, particularly with respect to the arrival and condition of commodities; the provisions for the maintenance of usual marketings; and information relating to imports and exports of the same or like commodities.

Article V
Consultation

The two Governments will, upon request of either of them, consult regarding any matter relating to the application of this agreement, or to the operation of arrangements carried out pursuant to this agreement.

Article VI

Entry Into Force

This agreement shall enter into force upon signature.

In witness whereof the respective representatives, duly authorized for the purpose, have signed the present agreement.

Done in duplicate at Washington, D.C., in the English and Polish languages this 3d day of February 1964.

For the Government of the Polish People's Republic.

FRANCISZEK MODRZEWSKI

For the Government of the United States of America.

GEORGE W. BALL

BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last night I received a telegram from Rev. John A. Wagner, of San Antonio, Tex., a member of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, concerning Public Law 78. Public Law 78 is the bracero program, perhaps better known as the Mexican slave labor law.

In his telegram Reverend Wagner isolates one of the arguments which has been put forth in defense of the slave law bracero program. That is, the argument that this program is necessary for the well-being of the Mexican economy. Reverend Wagner points out that narcotics and prostitution are also important to the Mexican economy, and he asks, "Does this mean that we should relax our narcotic law and openly advertise the house of pleasure so eagerly awaiting the American dollars just across the border?" Indeed, in our own country crime and disease are also important factors in the economy. But they represent wasteful factors and areas where our productive capacity must be diverted from more useful endeavors. The slave labor program is in the same class, for it robs tens of thousands of Americans of jobs and it thereby contributes to the economic disease we know of as unemployment.

With the unanimous approval of the Member of this House, I submit for the RECORD a copy of this excellent telegram, which urges that the odious bracero program not be continued after 1964. In this connection, I also submit a copy of

a letter I recently sent to President Johnson:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

February 18, 1964.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that the State Department is advising President Johnson to promise President Mateos at their forthcoming meeting that Public Law 78 will be continued with a 3-year phaseout period. You and I know what Public Law 78 has done to the poorest of the poor of our American citizens, especially the Mexican-American. This lamentable program must be allowed to die at the end of this year. Any extension of Public Law 78 is not consistent with the war on poverty declared by President Johnson.

The poorest of the poor American citizens must not be forced to compete with the tens of thousands of even poorer Mexican nationals. Our poorest citizens should not be made to pay this price, regardless of the advantage of the bracero program to the Mexican economy. Some urge that the continuation of the bracero program is necessary for the well-being of the Mexican economy.

Narcotics and prostitution are also important factors to the Mexican economy. Does this mean that we should relax our narcotic law and openly advertise the house of pleasure so eagerly awaiting the American dollars just across the border? Neither should the advantage to the Mexican economy be the reason for continuing Public Law 78. I urgently request that you read this wire before the Members of the House so that its contents may be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to emphasize the opposition of the National Council of the Spanish Speaking to any deal which would promise to anyone the continuation of Public Law 78 after the end of this year.

Rev. JOHN A. WAGNER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1964.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: No doubt among the topics you will discuss in your meetings with President Lopez Mateos will be included the future of Public Law 78, the bracero law.

This is to urge you in the strongest terms not to commit the administration to a further extension of this odious law and the program it created.

As you know, the question of extending Public Law 78 became one of the most controversial measure in the first session of this Congress. Originally efforts were exerted to get the bracero program extended until 1965, but this was defeated in the House. Only by the most strenuous efforts did proponents of the program gain a 1-year extension of the law.

Clearly, the sense of the Congress is that this program should come to an end on January 1. It is equally clear that President Kennedy opposed the program and intended not to extend it again. He pointed this out clearly in his administration and in strong terms.

In light of these facts, and in light of the incontrovertible evidence that the operation of the bracero program has caused much needless suffering to American farmworkers while being of little or no benefit to the Mexican workers, there can be no benefit to either this country or to Mexico by again extending this program.

I am very pleased that you have initiated a vast program to combat poverty in this country. No one knows as well as yourself that the poorest people in this country, and those who have the least hope, are American

migrant farmworkers. I urge you not to extend a program which is one of the chief causes for poverty in this segment of our society.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday inclement weather delayed my return to Washington as a result of which I am recorded as absent and not voting on rollcall No. 35. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted in the affirmative.

COMMITTEE STAFF FOR THE MINORITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker the reasonable protection of minority rights lies at the heart of representative government. Unless the minority is given equal opportunity to compete with the majority, democratic procedure becomes a mockery and a farce. Minority rights and democracy are indivisible.

This principle ought never to be compromised anywhere in our Government, but most especially not in this House of Representatives. Congress has had before its eyes almost from its birth Thomas Jefferson's reminder, expressed in the very first section of his "Manual of Parliamentary Practice":

That as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come in this House of Representatives when an additional rule is urgently needed so that the minority can continue to defend themselves. That rule must see to it, under one formula or another, that the minority party is permitted its fair share of committee staff aids.

The burdens and disadvantages under which minority members of the House have been forced to work because of the lack of adequate staff aid are fast becoming intolerable. If some substantial reform is not adopted in the near future, the minority party's utility as a responsible and responsive opposition will seriously deteriorate.

Every Member of this body knows about the vital role committee staffs play in the legislative process. The wide range and complexity of the problems we must deal with in our daily work require the presence of experts of many kinds. Technicians, scholars, researchers, writers, investigators, lawyers with specialized knowledge—without these professionals the membership of our committees would be so buried in the

mass of legislative proposals heaped upon them and so entrapped by the immense detail work that hardly a fraction of the work now accomplished would ever be performed.

Congress openly acknowledged the necessity for such assistance in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by authorizing every standing committee to employ professional staff "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

Unfortunately, the wording of the law placed the power to hire and fire such staff in the hands of the majority on each committee. Frequently, such power has been taken over by the chairmen with virtually no check upon their actions. Even more unfortunately, no provision of any consequence was made in the law to protect the rights of the minority to equal access to such staff. The unjust results of these provisions might have been mitigated somewhat if control of Congress had fluctuated between the two major parties. Unhappily, the present majority has maintained an all-too-long tenure.

As a result, the minority party in this House, outnumbered by a ratio of about 3 to 2, finds itself outmanned in the number of committee staff aids by about 8 or 9 to 1. I understand that the standing and select committees of the House employ approximately 500 professional staff members; only some 60 of these are permitted to the minority—figures are based on data compiled by the Republican Committee on Increased Minority Staffing.

Five of our committees actually employ no minority staff at all. On the Committee on Appropriations the staff responsible to the minority membership number barely more than one-quarter of the total. The Education and Labor Committee balance is about 10 to 1. The Judiciary Committee's ratio is about 12 to 1. The Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, has five majority staff aids for every one minority assistant.

Of course, numbers and ratios do not completely define the situation. On some committees the professional staff members appear to give both parties equal and objective service. Many other committees, however, are under the thumb of arbitrary and partisan chairmen. The persons who work for such individuals inevitably reflect their attitudes. Minority members of these committees are either refused staff assistance or cannot bring themselves to trust the small assistance that may be offered.

Even on those committees which enjoy a nonpartisan reputation minority members can hardly be blamed for their reluctance to employ the services of men and women whose very basic loyalty belongs to the majority. The Representative from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], leading advocate of reform in this area, has very rightly observed that to believe—

congressional staffs can be nonpartisan simply ignores political reality. Obviously staff members will have an allegiance to those members of a committee—who hire

and fire, promote and demote them, and have first claim on their time.

What are the practical effects of this staff imbalance? Minority Members of the House, like their majority brethren, are constantly pressed for time. Without sufficient staff aid, minority views, in too many instances, are not written when bills are reported. Committee investigations are carried on almost entirely from the majority point of view. Minority ideas for legislation or for improvements in legislation are often abandoned for lack of the manpower needed to develop them.

The implications of these difficulties go much further than mere inconvenience for the present minority party. They affect the very roots of American political theory and practice. It is the duty of the party in power to attempt to put its program through. But it is just as important for the political health of this country that the majority be faced with a vital, responsible, and dynamic opposition. Our legal and political systems are both based on the adversary system. The duty of the opposition party, in short, is to oppose, to prosecute, to criticize: vigorously, conscientiously, and intelligently.

The opposition is obliged to do even more. It must present to the public reasonable and applicable alternatives—and this takes staff work, often difficult and detailed staff work. As Senator HUGH SCOTT has said:

We of the minority are greatly concerned because the means of offering constructive alternatives, through adequate help in researching policy problems, is presently unavailable to us. Without adequate staff good ideas die for lack of public airing. We should all agree that good government suffers when the minority is deprived of the means to (1) develop constructive alternatives, (2) offer sound criticism and evaluation, (3) document and communicate its views, and (4) check information supplied by the majority against impartial sources.

The problem is acute at this moment. It will become more acute with every year that passes as the Nation's problems become more and more complex and as the necessity for sound alternatives becomes more crucial.

Moreover, there is every reason for the present majority in Congress to be as concerned about this situation as we are; there is no guarantee that the other side of the aisle will forever hold the reins of power.

What is to be done? How will the majority party carry out its obligation to maintain rather than maim our two-party system? We of the minority have offered an equitable solution, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and officially endorsed by the Republican conference of the House, the Republican Governors of the Nation, and the Republican National Committee.

We propose that the rules of the House of Representatives be amended. We propose that the minority Members of each committee be afforded the option of hiring staff members responsible only to them. We suggest that the minority group be empowered to appoint two out of every five professional staff members

and three out of every seven clerical employees on every standing committee and every subcommittee.

We do not insist upon a mandatory rule. On the contrary, we feel that the minority ought to exercise its option only on those committees in which it feels it is unable to obtain adequate service.

Mr. Speaker, this suggestion has received enthusiastic support from numerous columnists and newspapers all over the country. Sooner or later a solution must be found to this problem so that the minority in Congress may properly carry out its democratic function. But, any further delay in alleviating this staff imbalance could prove detrimental to the wholesome development of democracy in our country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. RANDALL for Thursday, February 20, on account of official business participating in hearings of Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CAMERON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. SICKLES.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. GARMATZ to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made today on H.R. 9640.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 178. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader;

S. 1488. An act for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace; and

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 20, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1724. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on development, procurement, and deployment of an unsatisfactory missile system by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1725. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a summary of findings in the report on the development, procurement, and deployment of a missile system by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1726. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pertaining to the appropriation to the Bonneville Power Administration for "Operation and maintenance," for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1727. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpayments made under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for the procurement of nuclear submarine components from Combustion Engineering, Inc., New York, N.Y., awarded by the Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary procurement initiated or planned because equipment requirements were overstated by White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1729. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overprocurement by the Department of the Navy of a spare fuse component used for the repair of missiles, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1730. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of December 31, 1963, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended, July 16, 1952, by Public Law

554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1731. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation giving effect to Legislative Recommendations Nos. 1 through 6 in the Commission's current (77th) annual report; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1732. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ending December 31, 1963, pursuant to section 14(b) of Public Law 685, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 631. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 9637, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 632. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 9022, a bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10023. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10024. A bill to grant credit for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by Federal employees under a cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the State of North Carolina with respect to the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 10025. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10026. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1906, to apply to the transportation of animals in interstate commerce by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10027. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10028. A bill to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States;

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10029. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.J. Res. 927. Joint resolution designating the 5-day period beginning September 21, 1964, as "Licensed Practical Nurse Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 928. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve, foster, and protect our Nation's spiritual heritage and deep-rooted dependence on Divine guidance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 628. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to declare the right of the House of Representatives to determine the qualifications of its Members; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 629. Resolution declaring the intent of the House of Representatives to retain its right to determine the qualifications of its own Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 630. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Serv-

ice to conduct an investigation and study of solicitations of certain contributions of Government employees for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10030. A bill for the relief of Demijohn D. Downer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 10031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga I. Sazdova and minor children, Zaneta Sazdova and Elisabeta Sazdova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 10032. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10033. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10034. A bill for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10035. A bill for the relief of Francisco Mougruza Fortea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

707. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to send to all teachers copies of "Reports To Be Made to Congress" as aids in teaching government and history; to the Committee on House Administration.

708. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass a commendatory resolution for the Supreme Court relative to its February 17, 1964, decision requiring congressional districts to reapportion on an equal population basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to ask the American people to ring bells and blow whistles for 3 minutes at noon March 4, 1964, to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

710. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Kearney County T-Bone Club of Minden, Nebr., objecting to the amount of imported beef, resolving that imports be reduced to not more than 5 percent of domestic consumption, resolving that members of the Kearney County T-Bone Club pledge themselves to not feed cattle to weights over 1,150 pounds, urging all cattle feeders to refrain from feeding cattle to over 1,150 pounds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Johnson-Home Communique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I voice the sentiment of this Chamber in hailing the recent Johnson-Home communique. Its tone of quiet confidence was a source of encouragement. It reflected an air of comity and candor. It revealed proven and tested allies working toward the attainment of common goals.

It was the first opportunity of President Johnson and Prime Minister Douglas-Home for a working meeting since they assumed the leadership of their respective Governments. But it followed in the high tradition of Wilson and Lloyd George, Roosevelt and Churchill, Kennedy and Macmillan.

Both men saluted the test ban accord, and at the same time reaffirmed their intent to search out other ways of reducing tension, of banishing the risks of war, of lifting the crushing burden of armament. In particular the Prime Minister welcomed the proposals made to the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference by the United States in President Johnson's message of January 21.

Both leaders pledged their full support to the United Nations.

The President and the Prime Minister affirmed our common hopes, aims, and aspirations in Southeast Asia. The Prime Minister reemphasized the United

Kingdom's support for the U.S. policy in South Vietnam. The President reaffirmed the support of the United States for the peaceful national independence of Malaysia.

But they found peace alone an inadequate goal. They sought it as a necessary precondition for expanding international trade and promoting economic growth for all to the end that all peoples of this world may live out their days free from the shroud of fear and the specter of want.

An Address by the Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at the Annual Dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health, February 11, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of meeting the needs of the mentally ill has become more visible in recent years. The neglect of the past has been replaced with new opportunities for the care and prevention of mental illness. Recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, gave a talk on this timely subject before the annual dinner of the Maryland Association for Mental Health

on February 11, 1964. Under previous permission I place the text of his excellent remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HEALTH, FEBRUARY 11, 1964

I feel very much at home here in Maryland among you who share with me concern for the mental health of our citizens. You who have had it in your hearts to join this gathering now have it in your hands to bring to your State a new era of promise for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded toward which we have labored so long.

We meet together at a time of great momentum in our Nation's drive against the mental illnesses. The community mental health centers program envisioned in recent Federal legislation, and toward which you are already planning in your mental health services, is a consummation of a nationwide effort, of two decades of study and work.

It is to this new opportunity I would like us to address ourselves this evening.

Mental health care today concerns every city and community and State in the country. This point has been made indelibly clear to us in Congress. I am sure it is just as clear to you, and that you in the Commonwealth of Maryland, who are no strangers to bold pioneering, will continue the vital planning, the action essential to breaking from the dreary patchwork of old ways.

We can look back to the days—the not-so-far-distant days—when the locked ward, the bolted door, and the barred window were our major gifts to the mentally ill; when they were regarded, if regarded at all, as inmates in the safe custody of State asylums.

Today the large, isolated asylum is as archaic as the last vestige of the narrow, one-lane roads we see beside our superhighways, the pock-marked relics which lead from nowhere to nowhere.